A DEFENCE OF THE REPORT,

CONCERNING

The *Present State* of the Differences in Doctrinals, between some Dissenting Ministers in *London*, in *REPLY* to a Book,

ENTITULED,

A *Faithful Rebuke* of that *Report*.

If I Build again the things which I Destroyed, I make my self a Transgressor. Gal. 2. 18.

The Wisdom that is from above is first Pure, *then Peaceable, Gentle, and easie to be Entreated.* Jam. 3. 17.

Ἄριστος τρόπος τοῦ ἀμύνεσθαι, τὸ μὴ ἐξομοιοῦσθαι.

The best way of Revenging an Injury is, not to imitate or resemble him that did it. Marc. Antonin. Lib. 6. § 6.

LONDON, Printed for *Nath. Hiller*, at the *Prince's Arms* in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, over against St. *Mary Axe*, 1698.

TO THE
READER.

Reader,

WHEN the *Report* was Publiſhed, I being in the *Countrey*, on my Return, ſeveral made Enquiry touching my *Thoughts* of it; to whom my Anſwer was; That whoever was the *Author*, I *knew* the *Matters of Fact*, therein contained, to be *True*; and *Believed* the Doctrines, Explained and Aſſerted in the *Healing Paper*, and pleaded for in the *Report* to be agreeable to Gods Word; and that I ſhould be willing, if at any time called thereunto, to do my moſt for their Defence.

Some *Weeks* after the *Report* had been Abroad, a *Brother*, who once, according to the *Talent*, wherein he excell'd, wrote in *Vindication* of the *Common Faith*, ſent forth a **Rebuke** to the **Report**; wherein both for *Matter* and *Manner*, he has expreſſed himſelf quite otherwiſe than formerly he had Written, or his *Trueſt* Friends at this time expected; and has really

given the Proteſtant Religion, in the Article of Chriſts *Satisfaction*, a moſt ſenſible Wound.

Theſe Controverſies, I doubt not, upon an Apprehenſion, that none but the Enemy to Religion will be hereby the Gainer, are very grievous to many *ſincere Chriſtians*; who, when they ſhall conſider, how much the **Truth**, by this *Colliſion*, will be cleared; the moſt Important Doctrines of our Holy Religion, be more throughly underſtood; more Firmly Believed, as well as more Irrefragably Defended againſt the Oppoſition made unto it; will Admire the Divine Wiſdom, and Adore the Riches of Glorious Grace, in bringing ſo much Good out of theſe Miſchievous Diviſions, which have been, and are amongſt us.

As for my own part, notwithſtanding the hard Cenſures of my **Reverend Brother**, I cannot forbare telling thee, That I deſire with my whole Soul to bleſs and praiſe the Lord, for the inſight he has given me into the Myſteries of **Chriſts Goſpel**, ſince this Controverſie hath been ſtated, and that I do **now** plainly ſee, how the very *Truths*, we were, through an unjuſtifyable *Supineneſs*, in danger of looſing, will, hereby be the more **clearly Diſcovered** and **effectually Secured**.

Diſcourſes from the **Pulpit**, even when about the moſt Evangelical Parts of Chriſtianity, having

having been of late Years, rather adjuſted to move the Affections than inlighten the Judgment, are but a *ſlender Fence unto Truth*; And an *Obſervance*, how they, who are ſound in the Faith, through a Zeal for *Populacy*, have neglected that Cloſe Study, which is neceſſary to a through underſtanding the *Important* Doctrines now under debate, hath emboldened the Adverſary to Oppugn them, and with the greater Vigour to attempt the expoſing the preſent *Miniſtry* amongſt us; and, to ſpeak freely, one Reaſon why our Brethren are ſo much confounded with the Noiſe of *Common Terms and Phraſes*, at this time Controverted and ſo eaſily Impoſed on, is their Diſuſe of ſuch Studies.

But, it's hoped that theſe Conteſts will provoke our Brethren to make more diligent Enquiries into the *Doctrines of Satisfaction and Juſtification*, as it has already rouſed up ſome Great Men to reſolve on a Defence of the very Points, now exagitated amongſt us. For, as I have heard thus much of *one* very Learned Perſon; ſo I did the laſt Night receive the enſuing *Letter* from another; in which, you'l obſerve enough to convince you it is from one of the firſt Rate among the Learned, whoſe *Sagacity*, and Sharpneſs is Conſpicuous, and his Reſentments Deep.

And, as the *Truth*, by theſe Methods will be abundantly cleared, ſo the *ſureſt Foundation* for a ſolid

a ſolid and laſting Union will be laid: For, whatever my Cenſorius Brother ſuggeſts to the contrary, 'tis the reſolution of the *Congregational Brethren* to do their moſt for PEACE, which they are ſure can never be laſting, if at the *Expence* of *Truth*, but let our *Presbyterian* Brethren joyn with us in the Defence of ſome *Proteſtant* Truths now in danger, they will find us to go ſo far as 'tis poſſible, with a good *Conſcience* for *Peace* and *Communion* with them.

That theſe Great Bleſſings may be obtain'd, is the fervent Prayer, and ſhall be the conſtant Endeavour of

Novem. 4. 1697. *S. L.*

The Letter *I mention, I will here inſert exactly as it came to my hands.*

Books Printed for Nath. Hiller, *at the* Princes Arms *in* Leaden-hall-ſtreet, *over againſt St.* Mary Axe.

THE Divine Inſtitution of Congregational Churches, *Miniſtry and Ordinances*, [As has been Profeſſed by thoſe of that *Perſuaſion*] Aſſerted and Proved from the Word of GOD. By *Iſaac Chauncy*, M. A.

A Diſcuſſion of the Lawfulneſs of a Paſtors Acting as an *Officer* in other Churches beſides *that* which he is ſpecially Called to take the Overſight of. By the late Reverend Mr. *Nath. Mather.*

To

To my Reverend, and much Esteemed Friend Mr. *Stephen Lobb.*

SIR,

I *Could heartily have wished, that there had been no Occasion administred for those Accusations, wherewith the* Presbyterian *and* Congregational *Divines have of late mutually charged one another. And though I do verily believe, that the* Latter *are as remote from all Friendliness to* Antinomianism, *as most of the* Former *are from being Tainted with* Arminianism, *or the having Embraced the* Dogmata *of* Socinus; *yet some* Crude *Writers of each Party, whose good Opinion of themselves, doth far exceed their Knowledge in those Controversies, have had the misfortune to speak less accurately, than the avoiding the being thought Infected with those* Heterodoxies, *would have exacted of them. But, as for your* Rebuker *I will venture to say, that he hath not only Departed from the Received Opinions of most* Protestant *Divines, but that he hath Trespass'd against all the Rules of good Breeding and Modesty in his* Pedantick, *as well as Insolent way of Writing. For, tho' I have not the vanity to pretend the being very Conversant in the* Socinian *and* Arminian *Controversies; yet I dare affirm that the* phrases, *which he assumes the liberty to Ridicule, as well as to Oppose, are those that they of the greatest character for Learning, who have Written either against the* Remonstrants, *or them of the* Racovian *Belief, have both used, and judged necessary to be adopted into their Debates, not only as a Fence about the Received Faith, and a Barrier against Irruptions upon common Christianity, but as such without which the Doctrines of* Christs Satisfaction, *and of our* Justification,

fication, *could neither be Orthodoxly nor Intelligibly expreſſed. And were it not, that I intend to* Imbarque in this Diſpute, *in caſe it be further ſupported on his part, I could at preſent eaſily expoſe the Ignorance of your* Rebuker, *both in* Claſſical *and in* Theological *Authors, which whenſoever I do, you may aſſure your ſelf it ſhall not be in the* Harlequin *and* Scarramuchio *ſtile. Nor do I think your Author will much raiſe his Reputation, by his ſetting up for an Eccleſiaſtical* Droll, *ſeeing beſides the Indecency of it, he will by few be thought the more* Witty *for acting the* Buffoon. *For a ſmall meaſure of* Intellectuals, *if accompanied with a great degree of* Aſſurance, *will qualifie any man to* Burleſque *all that is Sacred, and thereby to advance him among ſuch as are truly ſerious to the Title of Blaſphemous and Atheiſtical. And you may eaſily imagine, how not only your Gentlemen of the* Dry-Club (*whoſe* Libertiniſm *was too long countenanced as well as connived at by ſome amongſt you*) *but your Partizans againſt all Revealed Religion, will hug themſelves upon the Preſident ſet them by this* Diſſenter, *in his Treating the moſt important Articles of the Chriſtian Faith with a Contempt as well as a Jocularneſs, which either a Wiſe or Sober Man would not allow himſelf to uſe, even in relation to the Dreams and Romances of* Mahomet. *And to deal with you without reſerve, I will not be poſitive, in concluding what his Opinion is in theſe Controverſies, tho' I fully underſtand the Language wherein he expreſſeth it, ſeeing I have an* Exemplar *before me of his ſincerity, in an* Harangue *upon an Addreſs in which his meaning hath ſince appeared to be Contradictions to what he ſaid. But I will add this in Extenuation of the Authors guilt, that he uſeth ſometimes to be Delirous, and that then both his* Genius *and Diſtemper lead him to be Divertive and* Comical, *whereas when his* Lucida *returns, he leaves the* Stage *and puts off his* Buskins, *and reaſſumes the Gravity of a* Theologue, *and exchangeth the Language of the* Theatre *for that of the Pulpit. Sir Adieu.*

A

A REPLY TO A Faithful Rebuke.

IN my Endeavours to Clear the Report of the Present State of the Differences, in Doctrinals, between some Dissenting Ministers, in *London*, from the Charge of *Falshood*; and Vindicate the *Congregational* Brethren from the Accusation of being *Antinomian*; I will pass over the Delicate Language, with which the *Rebuker* hath *Adorn'd* his Discourses, as what is becoming neither the *August*, and *Sacred* Matters treated on, nor a *Divine*, a *Christian*, or a *Gentleman*; Wondring, that the Checks of his Friends, and the Sense of the like Contempt and Neglect, with which some years ago, his Adversaries Accosted him, when he had a Better Cause to Defend, have had no more Influence on him: Especially considering, that He is now Drawing so very near to that Age, which few Attain unto. But being of Opinion, that what this Reverend Brother hath herein done, is as much the Effort of another Man's Heats as of his own *Disturbed Thoughts*, I wou'd Hope, that on a serious Review, when he shall Reflect, not only on his way of Writing; but on the *Nature*, and *Severity* of those Accusations,

 which

which He hath, contrary to Truth, and without the leaſt Ground, loaded his *Congregational Brethren* with, he will ſee cauſe to *Bewail* what now He ſeems to *Triumph* in. I ſay, paſſing by theſe things, and whatever elſe may rather Provoke than Enlighten; I will Confine my ſelf to what he hath Objected againſt the *Reporter* and his *Brethren*, which may be Reduced to Matters of Fact, Doctrines of Faith, and Charge of Antinomianiſm.

I. Of Matters of Fact.

Faithful Rebuke.

'THE Reporter hath miſerably Impoſed upon 'you in *Matter of Fact*, and —— 1. One *Speci-*'*men* of his Honeſty, you ſhall meet with at the 'Entrance of his Paper —— And thus in a Pom-'pous Stile, He Breaks into the Buſineſs *after Sun-'dry attempts made by the* Induſtrious Partitators, an '*Inſtrument was pitch'd upon, which gave ſatisfaction to* 'the *moſt Learned of both Parties: This Paper was ſent* 'by *ſix, or ſeven of the Biggeſt Name among them, who* 'do, *or at leaſt have gone under the Denomination of* 'Presbyterians, *unto ſome* Congregational *Brethren,* 'and *gladly Embraced by them*, p. 12.

Reply.

This is one part of the *Charge* of *Falſhood* againſt the *Report*, and yet there is not One Word mentioned in this Place, but what is *True*. For, (1.) After ſundry Attempts, an *Inſtrument* was Pitch'd upon, which you have in the cloſe of the Report. (2.) This was ſent unto the *Congregational* Brethren, by ſix or ſeven of the Biggeſt name among the *Presbyterians*, of which number Mr. *Alſop* was one, as the Brethren to whom it was ſent can, and they by whom

it

it was ſent muſt Teſtifie. (3.) That it was ſent by ſome of the Biggeſt Name, is manifeſt, for the Hands of Dr. *Bates* and Mr. *Howe* are to the Letter, by which it was tranſmitted to the Congregational. (4.) That this Paper was gladly received by the *Congregational*; their own Subſcription doth Evince. (5.) That it gave ſatisfaction to the moſt Learned of both Parties, it is but to read over the Names of them who ſubſcribed it, and it will be found moſt True. (6.) That Mr. *Mather*'s, and Mr. *Cole*'s hands were not ſet to this Paper, was not, becauſe they Approved not of the Doctrines therein contained, for they both in the Hearing of many declared their Approval, tho' for ſome other Reaſons declined Subſcription.

Where then is the *Falſhood*? No where but in my Brothers own Imaginations; who adds,

Faithful Rebuke.

'Now Sir do you not Judge, that this Inſtrument '—— had Redintegrated the violated Union —— 'That all Diſtances were removed —— That they 'were all now got together again at *Little St. Hillens*? 'I aſſure you Sir, not a word of this was true. p. 13.

Reply.

No Sir, we had no reaſon to Judge thus, but the quite contrary, for there was not a word of this in the *Report*, where it's expreſly affirmed, (1.) 'That 'when matters were brought to this Head [as above] 'nothing but a Re-union, and a general Amneſty 'was in Proſpect. It was you ſee but in *Proſpect*; not come to an Accompliſhment; And, 'tis added, (2.) 'That this Re-union had enſued, had it not 'been for two or *three Oppoſers*, ſo that, unleſs the Oppoſition made unto the *Healing Inſtrument*; and the *laying it by*, doth ſignifie, that this Inſtrument had Redintegrated the violated Union, and brought all of 'em together again to *Little St. Hellens*, there is not,

there cannot be the leaſt Pretence for the charge of *Falſhood*. And whether theſe Expreſſions ſignifie what is moſt contrary to their genuine meaning, I ſubmit it to my Brother's *more ſober* Thoughts, and in the mean time will take it for granted, That there is nothing *Falſe* in this part of the *Report*, and paſs on to his *ſecond Inſtance*.

Faithful Rebuke.

'2. A ſecond Inſtance of the *Reporters* regard to '*Truth*, where you will eaſily obſerve how by a '*Wretched Senechdoche*, he has given you a part for 'the whole of a *Juſt Narrative*. p. 14.

Reply.

1. The *Reporter* never Pretended to give a *Narrative* of the *whole*: He knew that the doing ſo would rather widen than cloſe the wound; and therefore, it being his Deſign, whilſt he gave an account of what was done towards the making up the Breach, and where the laſt Stop was, to Soften and Prepare the Minds of the Brethren *for Peace*, He Induſtriouſly wav'd, as any one might perceive, the giving a *Full Narrative* of the *whole*: and in the Title Page, He Declared, That his Report was of the Preſent State, and therefore, not of what had paſſed ſome years ago. How then can any, conſiſtently with Truth, ſay, that by a *Wretched Senechdoche*, He hath given you a part for the whole of a *Juſt Narrative?*

2. A Deſire to *Accommodate matters* ſo far as poſſible, upon the *Bottom* of Truth, lyeth ſo much upon his Heart, that he doth Συν Θεῷ fixedly Reſolve againſt what is likely to Exaſperate. And therefore tho' this Brother hath given ſuch a *Partial* and *Untrue* Hiſtory of the whole, Relating to the Diviſion, as cannot be Detected without Publiſhing what we ought (I think) mournfully to cover. He Obligeth me at leaſt for the Preſent, to conceal ſuch Particulars, as much as ſincere Affection to the Truths of Chriſt's

Chriſt's *Goſpel* will allow; which I am the rather inclined to do, becauſe I find, that when the Report did ſo *calmly* give but a few Intimations about what had been done for Peace, what Advances had been made towards it by divers of the moſt Eminent of each Party, where the ſtop was, and what would Heal, they have put my Brother in to ſuch a Confuſion of Thought, as moves ſome to Fear, that a thorough ſearch into this Hiſtory, will diſcover ſuch Miſtakes, and give him ſuch a Diſturbance, as to make him wholly Unfit for that good work, for which God hath given him an Excellent Talent, and to which, with a ſincere Reſpect to him and his further Uſefulneſs, I do Heartily Wiſh he would henceforward Confine himſelf.

Having thus Cleared the *Report* from the Charge of *Falſhood*, as to matter of Fact, I will make what convenient haſt I can, to conſider what he hath Offered about Doctrinals. And to ſet what Relates hereunto, in the cleareſt Light, I muſt beg my Readers Patience to Obſerve, what is neceſſary to be ſuggeſted on this Occaſion. For, it muſt be Inculcated. 1. That we have no Controverſie with any Aſſembly of *United Miniſters*, as *ſuch*; not only becauſe we know of no ſuch meeting that hath been of late months at *Little St. Hellens*; but becauſe, when there were ſuch *Meetings*, they did not ſet their hands unto the Offenſive Book, and never Expreſſed any other way their Approbation of it.

That the meeting of Miniſters at *Little St Hellens*, is not compoſed of *United Brethren*, is manifeſt, in that the *Congregational*, who are an eſſential Part of the *Union*, have not (if we may believe my Brother) met with them. For he aſſures us, 'That they *gra-* 'dually with-drew from their Aſſemblies*,* and Common- 'Meetings; and not only ſo, but ſet up another Op- 'poſite-Meeting in a Neighbouring Place, at the very

'Hour, and on the ſame day that the United Bre-
'thren Aſſembled at Dr. *Anneſleys*; *Some few* of
'them would now and then drop in, when they had
'occaſion to ſerve themſelves of the *Union*, and com-
'monly there was one or two to *ſpie out their Liberty*.
Fa. Reb. p. 21.

Now what manner of Union can there be between two Parties, when there is but one Party to make it up? But,

2. The generality of thoſe Brethren, who were Paſtors of Churches, and did ſet their Names unto the Teſtimonial before the *Offenſive Book*, did thereby rather intend to expreſs their Juſt Abhorrence of *Antinomian* Dotages, than an Approval of the Book: for divers of them never Read the Book; nor can they bear, that the ſetting their hands unto the Atteſtation præfixed unto it, ſhould be Interpreted, as if it had been unto the *Book*, but only unto the *ſtate* of the *Truths* and *Errors* therein mentioned, and not unto the *Preface*, *Explications*, or *Proofs*.

3. That the true Reaſon, which influenced ſeveral of them, who meet at *Little St. Hellens* to Reject the *firſt Paper* was an Apprehenſion, that the Teſtimony, it gave againſt *Antinomianiſm*, was not ſo full as they could wiſh and thought needful (tho' it was as *full* as 'tis *now*, in the *third* Paper.) Not that they diſlik'd the Renunciation of *Arminian*, or *Socinian* Errours.

However, it muſt be acknowledged to be ſomewhat ſingular, if not unparallel in them, who Reject the *firſt Paper*, that, notwithſtanding the Complaints of our Offened Brethren, the Nature of the Errours, Charged on the Offenſive-Book; and the many miſchievous and fatal Conſequences, that have attended the Setting their Hand unto the Teſtimonial before it, they have not hitherto, that I can hear, Condeſcended ſo far, as to Examine, whether their Names have not given Countenance to ſuch Notions,

as

as are contrary to the *Holy Scriptures*, and the Faith Profeſſed by Proteſtants at Home and Abroad.

But, ſeeing what is thus ſurprizing flows from an *Exceſs* of *Charity* in them, to the Author of the Offenſive Book, it's now hoped, that the bold ſtroke, which the *Faithful Rebuke* hath given to the Doctrine of *Chriſts Satisfaction*, will awaken the *Presbyterian* Brethren to declare their Orthodoxy by their Teſtifying againſt what doth, in it, deviate from the Truth.

4. That the Controverſie is, in good earneſt, between the *Congregational*, and the Body of the *Presbyterian* Brethren on the one Part; and a *few*, who are with Mr. *Williams*, on the other. The Reaſons which move me to Judge thus are. 1. The generality of the *Preſbyterian* Brethren in this City, do ſtill firmly adhere unto the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion*, *Larger* and *Shorter Catechiſm*; from which, in the Controverted Points, ſome apprehend Mr. *W's*, tho' he hath ſubſcribed them, doth diſſent: and cannot chooſe, whilſt they have ſo many powerful Arguments for that Apprehenſion. Beſides, if there had not been a real Difference between him and them, how could Mr. *J. W.* and his Friends boaſt of a Brother's coming over unto them in the Point of *Juſtification?* 2. No one hath written much in the praiſe of Mr. *Ws* his Notions, but Mr. *Toland*; whoſe Opinions are well known both in *England* and *Ireland*: and this Brother, whom I am ſorry to ſee Liſted in defence of the ſame Cauſe. What the Reverend Mr. *Lorimer* hath written, as it is after another manner than what my *Rebuker* hath done; ſo the moſt in him in theſe Matters is his miſtaken *Charity* to Mr. *Ws*. For he is a Man, that neither thinks the Phraſes of *Chriſts ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*, and of a *Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt, and us*, to be either *New* or of a *Dangerous ſound*. Nor doth he deny, that our Lord Jeſus

did, as *our ſurety*, come under the *Bond* and *Curſe* of the *Moral Law*.

5. As for the Doctrine of Juſtification, Mr. *Ws*, if he will be true to his own avowed Principles, muſt come over to Mr. *Humphrey*, in the *denial* of the *imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, *in any other ſenſe*, than in its Effects.

'Tis true, Mr. *Ws* doth grant, that Chriſt by his Righteouſneſs, did not only purchaſe a *Conditional Grant*, of thoſe Effects, which he had merited by his Righteouſneſs; But, beſides *theſe Effects made ours*, the very Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to true Believers. *Goſpel Truth Stated*, p. 39. However, if we compare this paſſage with what is more lately and fully explain'd in his *Man made Righteous*, p. 77, *&c.* you will ſoon unravel the whole Myſtery, and ſee, that whilſt he is labouring to hide himſelf, for a while, in a Cloud of Words, he means nothing at all by this Grant. For he is moſt explicite in affirming, 'That the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as it was the 'Performance of the Conditions of our Salvation, is 'mediately imputed to the Believer. Chriſts very Per-'formance of the Conditions is (ſaith he) Imputed 'mediately in this *manner*. If one give me my Li-'berty, which he voluntarily purchaſed for me at 'a dear rate, he mediately gives me what he paid 'for my Ranſom, tho' immediately I receive my 'Liberty and a Right thereto.

Now what is this more than an *imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs in the Effects*? Becauſe the Effects of Chriſts death, ſuch as a *Right to Pardon*, &c. is given to the True Believer, therefore it may be ſaid, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs, the procuring Cauſe, is imputed unto him. As the money, which one gives for anothers Liberty, may be ſaid to be given to that other to whom Liberty is given, which is only in the effects of that Money; ſo Chriſts Righteouſneſs is

imputed

imputed, in that the effects of it are given unto us: that is to ſay, Chriſts Righteouſneſs is imputed to us mediately; It is imputed to us *mediante effectu*, or in its effects. If he can make any thing more of it, let him.

Beſides, ſo long as he, againſt the Common Sentiment of Proteſtants, denies a Commutation, or *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*; or, *that Chriſt ſuſtained the Perſon of ſinners*; or, *as our Surety came under the Bond and Obligations of the violated Law of works*, to anſwer thoſe Obligations for us: it is impoſſible there ſhould be, on his Principles, any other imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, but what is in *its effects*, which Mr. *Humphrey*, clearly underſtanding, does honeſtly Aſſert, and that he muſt do the ſame, or relinquiſh his Principles may be more diſtinctly proved at any time, that he will, tho' let him be but ſincere and confeſs it, I ſhall be moſt willing, with my Reverend Brethren, to conſider how far we are to extend our *Communion*, or Charity towards ſuch, wherein he will find me Charitable enough.

6. The Breach being on this account begun, it is now widened by a Rejecting the Aſſertion of a Neceſſity of a *Commutation* of Perſons between Chriſt and us, for the due explaining and defending the Doctrine of Chriſts ſatisfaction, and our Juſtification; together with a Laying by the *Uſe* of the *Phraſes of Chriſts ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners, of a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us; of Chriſts being our* Surety, *to anſwer for us the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works*; and the like. And made more *dangerous*, ſince theſe *Phraſes* have been ſo very much Ridiculed by this Brother.

But there being ſo much *wonder* made at an inſiſting on the *Uſe* of theſe *Phraſes*, I will, for the ſake of thoſe Brethren, who, either by diſuſe have forgotten; or, by reaſon of a too early and conſtant Application unto practical

practical Preaching, never throughly understood this necessary Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction; I will, I say, show how *useful* these Phrases are to *explain* this glorious and blessed Truth.

There are, in the Holy Scriptures, several Texts which discover and prove the Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction.

About the Genuine Sense of these Texts, the chief Controversie between the Reformed on the one hand, and the *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, on the other, doth Lye.

The Controverted Texts are such as speak of Christs *dying for our sins*, and *for us*; of his being *our Surety*, and a *Sacrifice for us*; and the like, that relate to these Matters.

The *different* Senses, which the Orthdox, and their *Adversaries* have of these Texts, I will distinctly Propose.

1. When it's said in Scripture, that Christ was *wounded* and *bruised* for our *Transgressions*; *suffered* and *dyed for our Sins*. *Socinus* and his Followers affirm, that the Expression [*for our sins*] signifies only a *Final Cause*, as if no more was meant than that *Christ dyed for our good*.

The Orthodox expresly Asserts, that [*For our sins*] in these Texts, imports an *impulsive meritorious Cause*; and *Grotius* proves against *Socinus*, that these words, *Christ suffered for our sins*, cannot be understood of a *Final*, but of *Meritorious Cause*. And, if our *sins* be the *Meritorious Cause* of Christs Sufferings, it necessarily follows, that Christs sufferings were a *Proper Punishment* for them, and must be satisfactory to Gods Justice, which *Grotius*, and the Right Reverend Bishop of *Worcester*, have unanswerably Proved.

2. When, in Scripture it is affirmed, that *Christ suffered, and dyed for us*, the *Socinians*, who Labour to reduce all to his suffering for our good only, are positive

poſitive, that the ſignification of the *Propoſition* [*For*] is, that Chriſt dyed noſtro bono, *for our good.* He ſuffered for our ſins, that is, ſay they, he ſuffered for our good; He dyed for us, that is, ſay they, he *dyed* only for our good.

On the contrary, the Orthodox aver, that the *Preposition* ὑπὲρ, *For*, when it's ſaid, Chriſt dyed *for us*, ſignifies a *Commutation*, or *Change of perſons between Chriſt and us*; which is aptly expreſſed by that other Phraſe, [*in our Place and Stead*] that is, Chriſt ſuffered not only for our good; but, that God might be glorified in our Redemption, Chriſt ſuffered in our *Place* and *Stead*; Chriſt in his ſufferings, did *ſuſtinere vicem, ſeu Perſunam noſtram.* He was put into our *Place, State* and Condition, that having the Guilt of our ſins laid upon him, he might, according to the *Rule of Juſtice*, ſuffer a Proper Puniſhment for our ſins, and ſo make Satisfaction to Gods Juſtice for us.

When it's ſaid, Chriſt came into our *Place, State* and *Condition*, the meaning is, he came under the *Bonds* and *Obligations* of the violated Law of Works, lay under the Guilt and Puniſhment of ſin on our behalfs, that we, by laying hold on Chriſt by Faith, might be delivered.

The Phraſes then of a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt, and us, of Chriſts taking on him the Perſon of Sinners, ſuffering in their Perſon, Rooms* and *Stead*, are moſt apt to convey unto our *Underſtandings* the true, the *Orthodox*, and *Genuine* Senſe of theſe Texts, *Chriſt dyed for our ſins, and for us*, in oppoſition to the Socinian Interpretation, that is to bring all to Chriſts *ſuffering* for *our good only*; which they do, that they may the better ſubvert the Doctrine of a *Real, Proper and full Satisfaction* to *Gods Juſtice.*

3. The Term Surety, when ſpoken of Chriſt in Scripture, relates to us as we are *Sinners*, endebted

to

to the *Law*, and Juſtice of God and imports a *Change of Perſon between Chriſt, and us*; *Chriſts ſuſtaining our Perſon, coming into the Bond*, we had forfeited and *in our Place and Stead, anſwering for us the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works.*

4. Chriſts being made *a Sacrifice for us*, doth ſignifie the ſame, for that Chriſt might be a *Proper Sacrifice* for us; 'twas neceſſary that he ſhould be *ſubſtituted into our Place and Stead*, as the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, as well as *Grotius*, have fully proved.

'Tis true, *Epiſcopius* and his Followers, pretend a Zeal for Chriſts being a *Proper Expiatory Sacrifice*, but then they declare that *Chriſt*, when ſacrificed for us, did not ſuffer a *Proper Puniſhment* for our ſins: But the *Orthodox* have cleared it, beyond all doubt, that Chriſt, as our Sacrifice was ſubſtituted into our *Place* and *Stead*; that this *Subſtitution* cannot be without a *Commutation* of *Perſons between him and us*; that hereupon Chriſts ſufferings, when he was ſacrificed for us, became a *Proper Puniſhment* for our ſins.

The Uſe then of theſe Phraſes [*of a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt, and us*; *of Chriſts ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*; *of his ſuffering in our Place, Stead and Perſon*; *of his coming under the Bands and Obligations of the Violated Law of Works*; *of his anſwering for us theſe Obligations*,] are uſed by the Orthodox, as moſt apt to explain the Doctrine of Chriſts *Satisfaction*, and diſtinguiſh it from the *Socinian* Hereſie.

They are the *Phraſes* pitched upon by the Godly Learned, to deliver unto us the ſound meaning of thoſe Scriptures, which ſpeaks of Chriſts *ſuffering for our ſins*; *dying for us*; being our *Surety*, and made a *Sacrifice* for us.

But, if you will Reduce all to Chriſt's ſufferings in our *Place*, and *Stead*; and by *theſe Expreſſions*, avowedly Declare, that *it's Impoſſible for* that Phraſe, to ſignifie any more than *for our good*, and to turn *noſtro Loco*,

Loco, into *noſtro bono*, you give up the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, and Sacrifize the Truth to the Luſts of its greateſt Enemies, for Chriſt's ſuffering *only for our Good*, reſpects only *Man*; and the ſignification of *Chriſt's making Satisfaction* doth primarily reſpect *God* the *Juſtice*, and *Righteouſneſs of* his *Nature*, which is not included in his ſuffering only *noſtro bono*; for which reaſon if Chriſt ſuffered *only for our Good*, He did not by his ſufferings make ſatisfaction unto *God's Juſtice*.

Theſe things, (which will be diſtinctly handled in my vindicating the *Report* from *Falſhood* in Doctrinals) do ſufficiently ſhew how neceſſary the Uſe of theſe *Phraſes* is, how Dangerous to recede from them, and how liable to ſuſpicion ſuch Brethren are, who do not only Oppoſe, but with Scorn and Contempt Reject them.

It now remains, that I proceed to Examine *what it is*, that my Reverend Brother chargeth the *Report* with, in matters *Doctrinal*.

II. Of Doctrinals.

IN the *Report* we may obſerve an Intimation given of ſundry Points, which were in the *Firſt Paper*, but left out of the Third, and the leaving 'em out of the *Third* inſiſted on as what encreaſed the *Offence* of our *Grieved Brethren*.

I. *An* Expunging *that* Paragraph *which in the* Firſt Paper, *did Aſſert the Neceſſity of a* Change of Perſons, between Chriſt *and* Us, *in order to a due Explaining, and Defending the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, and our Juſtification.*

II. *A Rejecting the Phraſe of* Chriſt's ſuſtaining the Perſon *of* Sinners.

III.

III. *The Denying a* Change *of* Persons *between* Christ *and* Us.

IV. *An Imposing a* Socinian *sense on the Phrase of* Christ's suffering in our Place *and* Stead.

V. *A Turning* Christ's Undertaking *to Answer for us the* Obligations *of the Violated Law of Works, into Christ's Answering for our Violation of the Law of Works.*

VI. *Why so many Orthodox* Terms *and* Phrases, *which were in the* First *Paper are left out of the* Third ?

And seeing it is boldly said, That our Controversie with them is not about what is owned, or so much as Countenanced in any Publick Confessions, I will under this Head of *Doctrinals* make Answer to the Enquiry.

VII. *In what* Confessions *are* the Terms, *or* Phrases *so much Contended for to be found ?*

Before I discourse on any of these points, 'twill be requisite, that I set before you the Reason, which my Brother gives for their rejecting those *Passages, Terms* and *Phrases*, that were in the *First Paper*. You shall have it in his own words.

Faithful Rebuke.

'The Brethren did Unanimously agree to Grant 'as much as the *sound Sense* could Bear; and modestly to wave, and pass by *the other*, which was *liable* 'to be Interpreted to a *sense* and *sound* of *Malignity* to 'the *whole* of the *Gospel*. p. 30.

Reply.

This passage of my Reverend Brother doth make it manifest, That the *Paragraphs, Terms*, and *Phrases*, which were in the *first* Paper, and were waved and passed by in the Composure of the Third, are look'd upon by my Brother, and as he will have us believe,

by

by all the Miniſters, who meet at *Little St. Helens*, and had a Head, a Hand, and a Heart in Compoſing the *Third*, could not bear a ſound ſenſe, but were liable to be Interpreted to a *ſenſe*, and *ſound* of *Malignity* to the *whole* of the *Goſpel*. That is to ſay, The Phraſe of *Chriſt's putting on the Perſon of Sinners*; of his *Anſwering for us the* Obligations of *the Violated Law of Works*, the *Term*, *Surety*, and the Aſſertion of the *Neceſſity* of a Commutation, or *Change of Perſons* between *Chriſt and Us*, in order to *Explain*, and *Defend* Chriſt's Satisfaction, cannot in their Opinion bear a *ſound ſenſe*, but are liable to be Interpreted to a *ſenſe*, and *ſound* of *Malignity* to the *whole* of the Goſpel.

This is the ſenſe of my Reverend Brother, concerning which I will only ſay, that tho' I think my ſelf bound in *Civility* to believe what he ſaith of himſelf, yet I dare not be ſo ſevere as to conclude, that all my *Presbyterian Brethren* who meet at *Little St. Hellens* are in theſe Points of his Mind. However I deſire my Reader to have Recourſe unto this Paſſage, when He conſiders what I offer under the *Particulars* Propoſed to be Examined. To the Firſt,

I. An Expunging that *Paragraph*, *which in the* firſt Paper *did Aſſert the* Neceſſity *of* a Change *of* Perſons between Chriſt and Us, *in order to a Due* Explaining *and* Defending *the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction*, and our *Juſtification*.

That a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us* is neceſſary *to a due* Explication *and* Defence of Chriſt's Satisfaction *and our* Juſtification, is ſo very manifeſt, that it cannot but ſurprize us, to Hear from a Brother who pretends to Believe both, that it is not ſo.

What more Evident, than that if the Lord Chriſt hath not made Satisfaction to God's Juſtice *for us*, there

there is nothing Left for the Relief of a *Convinced* Sinner, or for Healing a Wounded Spirit: for there is no Room, no Place for our being Juſtified in the Court of Heaven. If no Satisfaction, there can be no Juſtifying Righteouſneſs found for us, to appear before the Bar of God in. 'Tis Chriſt's Righteouſneſs alone, that can paſs the Examen in the Great Day of the Lord; and without *that* no Soul Living can be Juſtified.

But, if Chriſt Endured not *the Puniſhment due* to us for ſin, by Anſwering for us the *Obligations* of the Violated Law of Works, there can be no *Proper Satisfaction* made to the Juſtice of God for Us, for Satisfaction taken ſtrictly and in a proper ſenſe is *ſolutio Debiti*, a Suffering the *Puniſhment due for our Sin*. That the *Puniſhment* of our Sins could not be born by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, unleſs there were a *Commutation of Perſons* between *Chriſt* and *Us*, whereby the Lord Jeſus came under the Bonds and Engagements of the Violated Law of Works, that we might be Delivered, is as Evident.

Theſe things are ſo plain, that whoever throughly Underſtands this Doctrine, whether the *Orthodox*, *Socinian*, or *Arminian*, they make no doubt of it, and therefore ſuch as oppoſe the Doctrine of a *Proper Satisfaction*, deny a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, and thereby turn Chriſt's Sufferings from being *Properly* a Puniſhment to be only *vicarious*, that is, *vice pœnæ*, Grievous, and Painful Afflictions inſtead of a proper Puniſhment.

Whether what I here Aſſert be not the Truth Revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, I appeal to all ſound Divines, whether in the Church of *England*, *Scotland*, or the Reformed abroad.

However, if we may Believe my Brother, the *Aſſertion* of the *Neceſſity of a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt*, and *Us*, in order to a due Explaining

and

and Defending Christ's Satisfaction and our Justification *cannot bear* a Sound sense, but is *liable to be Interpreted* to a *sense* of *Malignity* to the *whole of the Gospel.*

If this be not matter of Just Grief to the Godly Learned amongst us, what can be so? Here is an Exposing to the uttermost Contempt a Truth of very great Importance.

II. *The Phrase of* Christ's sustaining the Person *of Sinners is Rejected.*

That they Reject this Phrase, of *Christ's Sustaining the Person of Sinners,* is so manifest, that my Brother doth not only prove the Charge to be true, but Expresseth himself against the Use of this Phrase, with Vehemence and Heat. Take his own words.

Faithful Rebuke.

'For *Christ* to take upon *him the Person of sinners,* 'as the phrase is New and *Uncouth,* so it is to me '*Unintelligible,* till they who have invented it shall In'terpret it, *p.* 10. —— This New phrase, *Christ* '*took upon him the Person of sinners,* is a phrase to '*Puzzle* and *Confound* mens Understandings. *p.* 11. '—— Now succeeds the *Coining Age,* and *they* 'have *stamped,* and Counterfeited some New *Phrases,* '*Terms,* and *Expressions,* such as *Christ's taking on him* '*the Person of Sinners.* p. 32.

Reply.

1. This is no new *Phrase,* but Used and Contended for by the Orthodox against the *Arminians* many years ago. If you consult the Learned *Peter du Moulin,* his *Anatomy* of *Arminianism,* you'l find, that near fourscore years ago, he charged the *Arminians* with denying, that Christ *sustained the Person of the Elect when on the Cross.* cap. 27. § 6. And, in the following *chapter,* § 30. he thus expresseth himself.

'When these *Sectaries* deny, that *Christ* did, when 'on the Cross, *sustain the Person of the Elect*, they do 'plainly contradict what is Affirm'd by Christ in '*Joh.* 10. 11. The good Shepherd lays down his Life '*for* his Sheep, and those other places in *Joh.* 15. 13. '*Ephes.* 5. 25.

Joannes Arnoldus Corvinus in his *Censure* on the *Anatomy*, freely declares in the Name of the *Arminians* they do deny, *that Christ sustained the Person of the Elect, when on the Cross.* cap. 27. §. 6.

2. The Learned *Du Moulin* was not singular in his Opinion, for what he asserted on this Occasion was the Faith of the Reformed, which I will evince, beginning with the mention of some Learned Divines amongst our selves in this Island. And it's worthy Remark, that the Reverend Dr. *Bates*, who is known to be no *Antinomian*, doth affirm in his *Harmony*, p. 240. 'That, as in *Civil* cases, where one becomes '*Surety* for another, He is *Obliged* to pay the *Debt*, 'for in the *Estimate* of the Law, they are but *One* '*Person*, *Heb.* 7. 22. So the Lord Jesus entring into 'this Relation, sustained the Person of sinners, and 'became Judicially *One with them*; and according to 'the Order of Justice was liable to their Punishment.

What the Doctor hath here observed, gives Light touching the Genuine Import of the Phrase of *Christ's taking on him the Person of sinners*, as it is included in Christ's *Sure-ishp.* For, when it's said, Christ is our *Surety*, if it be meant of his Paying our Debts to the Law, and Justice of God, as it is by the Orthodox, the Term *Surety* must necessarily imply Christ's *sustaining our Person*, it being the part of a Surety to take on him the Person of a Debtor, to Represent him, and stand *so* in his *Place* and stead as to come into the same Bond, and under the same Obligations the Debtor stood.

Thus much is the Import of the Term, *Surety*, and

and ſignification of *Chriſt's ſuſtaining* the *Perſon of ſinners*, that is, The Lord Chriſt came into the Bond, we Forfeited, lies under the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works, and in our *Perſon*, Repreſenting Us, He Paid the Debt we Contracted, by ſuffering the Puniſhment we Deſerved.

Tho' Chriſt had not any *Demerit* of his own upon him, yet as the learned Biſhop *Reynolds* has it, 'He 'had the Guilt of Sin ſo far upon him, as it Notes 'the Obligation and Subjection unto Puniſhment, 'as he was *our Surety*, and ſo in *ſenſu forenſi*, in the 'ſight of *Gods Court of Juſtice*, *One with us*, who had 'deſerved the Puniſhment imputed to him, on *Pſal.* 110. *p.* 439.

Chriſt, as our *Surety*, ſuffered in our *Perſon*, *Repreſenting us*, and as the great *Placeus*, in the *Salmurian Theſes de Juſtificat.* ſect. 29. Obſerves, what *Chriſt* as our *Surety*, in our Perſon or Name ſuffered may be very truly imputed unto us. 'Who can, 'ſaith he, deny the Imputation of that Satisfaction 'unto us, which was made by our *Surety*, in our 'Name?

To the ſame purpoſe the learned Mr. *Rutherford*, who was not only an Enemy to *Antinomian* Hereſies, but One, who did Unanſwerably Confute them, this worthy Perſon, ſo juſtly celebrated, not only throughout *Scotland*, but by the learned in this *Kingdom*, and abroad for his Excelling Learning, Piety, and ſound Judgment, makes it his Province to prove againſt the *Arminians*, and *Socinians*, that Chriſt in ſuffering *ſuſtained the Perſon of the* Elect, and that the Orthodox ſignification of the phraſe in our *Place* and *Stead* is, in our *Name* or *Perſon*; of which more hereafter in due ſeaſon, but in this place I will only Remark, how he preſſeth, that Chriſt's *Suretiſhip* can import no leſs than his *ſuſtaining the Perſon* of them for whom he ſuffered. His words are,

'He, who being under the Law, paid that Law-
'Debt of Satisfaction, which the Elect *in* their Per-
'ſons ſhould have paid, He *ſuſtained the Perſon of the*
'*Elect*, in his ſuffering. But Chriſt being made un-
'der the Law, paid that Law-Debt of Satisfaction,
'which the Elect in their Perſons ſhould have paid.
'*Ergo.* The Propoſition is out of doubt. So far
He, who ſaith expreſly, that what is here affirmed
by my Rebuking Brother to be *Unintelligible*, fit to
Puzzle and *Confound* mens Underſtandings, is ſo *eaſie*
to be *Underſtood*, that there is no place left for doubt,
for, as He adds in the next page. '*None who Dyeth*
'*as a Surety*, or *pays as a Surety*, but He bears the
'Perſon of ſuch as He Pays for. These things are
Aſſerted by him, in his *Treatiſe of the Covenant of*
Grace. Part 2. *p.* 252, &c.

I will add one Teſtimony more, and that is what I find in the *Catechiſm* of Mr. *Nowell*, received with the greateſt Honour, above theſe Hundred years, in the *Church* of *England*, where you have theſe words; 'Chriſt *for us* ſuffered, and went through *Horrible*
'*Fears*, and moſt *bitter Griefs* of mind, to *ſatisfie*
'God's Juſt *Judgment* in all things, and to Appeaſe
'his Wrath. For to *Sinners*, *whoſe* Perſon Chriſt
'did here Bear, not only the Sorrows and Pains of
'preſent Death are due, but alſo Death to Come
'and Everlaſting.

But theſe Authorities being only in the *Engliſh* Tongue, can only prove, that the Phraſe of *Chriſt's bearing the Perſon of ſinners* is *not ſo New*, as my Brother affirms, I will go on to enquire, *whether this* odd *Phraſe* (to uſe my Brothers own words) *durſt ſhew its Face* in *Latin*? For my Brother ſaith it durſt not.

Faithful Rebuke.

'Seeing the great Struggle hath been, not about
'the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as the Report Miſrepre-
'ſents it, but about ſome odd Phraſes, and Expreſ-
'ſions

'ſions, in which 'tis cloathed, eſpecially theſe of 'Chriſt's *ſuffering in the Perſon of ſinners* —— whether if this be a ſound, and ſafe way of Expreſſing 'that great Doctrine, it will not endure to ſhew its 'naked Face in ſome other of the *learned Languages?* 'And if you pleaſe make an Experiment, how well 'it will look in *Latin?* —— Now what is *ſuſtinere* '*Perſonam alterius?* —— Whatever Excuſe they can 'have for the *Engliſh phraſe*, I know not, it's pretty 'hard to Damn all the World for an *Angliciſm*, p. 53.

Reply.

1. What my good Brother means by theſe Reflections on the phraſes of *Chriſt's ſuſtaining* and *ſuffering* in the Perſon of ſinners, leſs than that, in his Opinion, they were never uſed by any Author, who wrote in *Latin*, and that this learned Language wants apt words to expreſs them by, I cannot comprehend. But,

2. This being the manifeſt ſenſe of my reverend Brother, I ſhall be neceſſitated to Try his *Skill*, or *Integrity*, or *both*; For, nothing more Obvious than that they, who have wrote in *Latin*, on this Subject, have Uſed theſe phraſes, and that *Cicero* himſelf hath found out apt words to render the *Bearing the Perſon of another* into good *Latin*.

3. The *Authorities* I deſign to preſs ſhall be of ſuch Great Men, as are moſt diſtant in their Judgment, from *Antinomian* Notions, and paſſing by the *Lutherans*, viz. *Calovius*, *Dorſheus*, *Scherzerus*, *Quenſtedius*, and many other ſuch, who are in this *Article* very ſound, I will Confine my ſelf to the *Reformed*. *Eſſenius*, in his Defence of *Grotius de Satisfactione*, lib. 1. ſect. 4. cap. 5. part 1. p. 128. hath it thus, 'That 'Chriſtus Perſonam noſtram *ſuſtinens*, &c. Chriſt *ſuſtaining our Perſon*, there was a *Commutation* of his 'Death for ours, that we might attain unto Life.

Hoornbeck, who underſtood this Controverſie as well as any one, lays it down as a *General Rule*, by which we are to guide our ſelves, in the management of it, 'That *Chriſtus eorum Perſonam ſuſtinuit*, Chriſt '*ſuſtained the Perſon* of them, for whom he made 'Satisfaction by his death, was in their *Place*, and '*State*, and took on him to bear their Guilt on him-'ſelf. *Miſcel. Sac. lib.* 3. *p.* 396.

Nor can there be any thing more Remarkable upon this Occaſion than what *Rivet* Replies to *Bellarmine*'s Anſwer to the Common Argument of Proteſtants, for our being Juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; in which place, after he had urged a great deal in detecting *Bellarmine's Sophiſtications*, he adds, That Chriſt is to be conſidered, firſt as in himſelf, and then with reſpect *to us*, whoſe *Perſon he ſuſtains*; that Chriſt conſidered in himſelf is *Juſt*, *Holy*, without *Spot*, and ſeparate from Sinners, but in reſpect *to us*, he is ſaid to be *made ſin*: He is our Surety, and ſo a *Debtor*. *Rivet. Cathol. Orthod. Tom.* 2. *Tract.* 8. *Querſt.* 2. *num.* 35.

Cloppenburch is as poſitive; for, in his Enarrat. in 53. *Iſa.* ſaith he, 'When it's affirmed, that our ſins 'are imputed unto Chriſt, we muſt underſtand it, that 'he is truly made ſin, tho' not in *himſelf*, yet *in our* '*Perſon* he may be reckoned and eſteemed as the 'Debtor: for, by reaſon of his *Suretiſhip*, he is *Ju-*'*dicially* eſteemed One Perſon with us. pag. 79.

Witſius, to whom Dr. *Chauncey* and Mr. *Williams* have appealed in this Controverſie, declares it as his Judgment, 'That Chriſt was ſo ſubſtituted for the 'Elect, and ſo *ſuſtained their Perſon*, that there is a 'Permutation or Change of Perſons. *Animad. Iren. Cap.* 2. § 8. and elſewhere, *Chriſt did not Undertake, or make Satisfaction for any, but them, whoſe Perſon he ſuſtained.* De Oecon. Fœd. lib. 2. cap. 9 § 1.

To

To these I will only add *Voetius*, who having Asserted, 'That Christ, as our *Surety*, *sustained the Person of all them that shall be saved by him*,' and so fulfilled all that Righteousness of the Law, which they could not do, tells us, 'That the *Remonstrants*, who are justly suspected for Leaning too much towards the *Socinians*, do hold no other *Satisfaction*, and *Merit*, than such an appeasing God, the offended Party, as that, by which he is so far satisfied as to be willing to Receive Offenders into favour; and by which Christ has acquir'd for the Father, a Right of Entring into a New Covenant with Men, from whence (adds he) it follows, That Christ was not truly *our Surety*, that *he suffered not* in our *Place* and *Stead*; that he did not in a proper Sense Purchase and Procure any thing for us; nor did he, when on the Cross, *sustain the Person of the Elect. Select. Disput. Theol. p.* 2. de Merito Christi; pag. 133,134. *Calvin* also uses it on *Gal.* 3. 13.

These few Instances are enough to convince an Unbyassed Mind, that the Phrase of *Christs sustaining our Person*, hath been commonly used, both by the Reformed at Home and Abroad; that it hath been insisted on as necessary to secure the Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction from *Arminian* and *Socinian* Incroachments, and that it has dared to show its *Face* in *Latin*. But my Brother's further Enquiry is, *Doth it appear in good Latin?* To which I answer.

5. This Phrase, *sustinere Personam alterius*, is *Cicero* all over, for (saith he *de Orat.*) *Tres Personas unus sustineo, meam, Adversarij & Judicis.*

This Matter is so very plain, that how excusable soever my Brothers Instructor may be, in making such Mistakes, my Brother himself, who is so good a *Latinist*, discovering so much *Unacquaintedness*, not only *with Divinity*, but with that Learned Language, in which, if in any thing, excepting *Wit*, he must be

eſteèmed to excel, cannot be entirely excuſed. For what more evident, than that, if *Cicero* may be Regarded as a Competent Judge in this Caſe, *ſuſtinere Perſonam alterius*, is ſuch good *Latin*, that it need not be afraid to Look my Brother in the face. However,

6. This Brother will have it, that the Phraſe of *Chriſts Suſtaining our Perſon*, is *Unintelligible*, fit to *Puzzle* and *Confound Mens Underſtanding*, uncapable of a ſound Senſe, and liable to be interpreted to a Senſe and Sound of Malignity to the whole of the Goſpel, as if all that have uſed it, ſuch as Dr. *Bates*, *Rutherford*, *Calvin*, and the Generation of the Orthodox had deſigned to confound the World by the Uſe of barbarous and pernicious Phraſes, and had been guilty of the unrighteous Charge, with which the *Engliſh Unitarians* have burdened them, when they Reproach them for amuſing Mankind with the *Jargon* of *Unintelligible Terms and Phraſes*. And as if ſuch an Accuſation had been too mean, my Brother runs higher. For

7. He expoſes the Phraſe of *Chriſts ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*, to the greateſt Contempt and Scorn, as if it Repreſented the bleſſed Redeemèr in the moſt glorious undertaking of ſalen Mans Recovery, to be *Hiſtrionical*. His Words are,

Faithful Rebuke.

'We are told of Chriſts *ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*: ——— What can this *Expreſſion ſignifie*, 'but that Chriſt wore the *Mask*, the *Vizer*, the *Diſguiſe* of Sinners? That he was *Perſonatus Hiſtrio*? 'Like a Stage Player, that puts on the Perſon of a 'King, when indeed he is but ſome *Sorry Fellow*. ——— pag. 53.

Reply.

1. That the Phraſe of Chriſts *ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*, ſhould be ſo vilely miſ-repreſented by any one

one of them, who meet at *Little St. Hellens*, is equal Matter of Aſtoniſhment and Humiliation. And to be Juſt unto Truth, I muſt turn unto the Reverend Brethren, who ordinarily Aſſemble at that Place for their Judgment in this caſe, whether the *Phraſe* of Chriſts ſuſtaining *the Perſon of ſinners, can ſignifie nothing but his wearing the* Mask, the Vizer, the Diſguiſe *of Sinners, as if he had been a ſorry Stage Player?* This is the Caſe that deſerves, yea, that calls for your determination; for my Brothers words are, *What can theſe Expreſſions ſignifie, but that Chriſt wore the Mask*, &c. Sirs, the Eyes of a whole Nation are upon you, and the Eyes of the Reformed Churches Abroad, will be upon you, to ſee whether you will give Countenance to ſuch an Abuſe of Truth, and its Renowned Defenders. But to Return to my Brother.

2. Why, cannot this Phraſe ſignifie nothing elſe? If he had but gained a little ſmattering in the *Civil Law*, he would have ſeen that it could have born another meaning. There he might have Learned, 'That there is a *Moral Perſon* diſtinct both from a 'Phyſical, and *Ficta Perſona*; That a Moral Perſon 'is one placed in the *State* and Office of them, whoſe 'Perſon he ſuſtains; That One ſingle Man being put 'into the different States and Conditions of many, 'puts on their Perſon; That a peculiar Species of 'Political Perſons may be called Repreſentative, be-'cauſe they repreſent the *Perſons* they bear; for in-'ſtance, *Ambaſſadors*, *Vice-Roys*, *Syndicks*, and the 'like. And in the more inferior Station, the *Tutor* 'ſuſtains the *Perſon of the Pupil*, the *Guardian* of the 'Minor, and yet none of theſe are *Stage-Players*; 'for to a *Repreſentative Perſon*, ſomewhat more be-'longs than meer *Repreſentation*, they are ſuch as do 'ſomewhat for the Advantage of them, whoſe *Per-'ſon* they ſuſtain; That theſe *True Moral Perſons* are

diſtinct

'distinct from them, who are but *Fictæ* as *Stage-*
'*Players* are: That the *Fictæ Personæ*, or *Stage*
'*Players*, are but the *Umbræ*, or Shadows of
'the True. That the Essence of these *Fictæ Personæ*,
'consists only in Representation of the *Habit*, the
'Gesture, and the like of another. And as *Pufendorf*
'further declares, Veras Personas morales, *quas pro-*
'*ducit Impositio, haudquidquam ita est Libera, quin ejus-*
'*modi* Qualitates *debeat* præsupponere, *quæ* aptæ *sint,*
'*ut* solidus aliquis *effectus in vitâ humanâ inde Eveniat.*
'*Et illas, qui circa Constituendas Personas negle xerint per*
'*vecordem Petulantiam mortalibus insultare est Censendus.*
'*Pufend. de Jure Nat. & Gent. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 1. *Edit.* 3.
'*pag.* 15.

That this good Brother therefore, whilst so Unacquainted with what is so much known to every body, who understands this Controversie about *Christs Satisfaction*, and his *Suretyship*, should so far forget himself as to write after the rate he hath done, may very well be a Caution to others to take heed, how they go beyond their last, or, how they suffer themselves to be hurryed on a Controversie before their Heats are over, and they have got time to deliberate, and digest what they write about. Had my Reverend Brother been more cool, had he got more time to consider, and weigh well what he did, he could never have been thus imposed upon to wound his own Reputation as he hath done, in the use he hath made of *Milton*: *Milton*, tho' he saith, *Salmasium risum pene Legentibus* Multiplici Barbarismo *concitasse*, could not charge *Salmasius*, with more Instances of Barbarism, than my Brother is fallen into mistakes in the use he makes of *Milton*. For,

1. *Salmasius* Writes not of a Moral Representative Person, but of the *Natural Person* of the King; there was, saith he, a Paricide Committed on the *Person* of the King, that is, on his Natural, his own proper Person.

2. When

2. When *Milton* Banters *Salmaſius* with a *Pſeudo-Philip*, he mentions not a word of a *Moral Perſon* neither; but ſpeaks only of a meer *Ficta Perſona*, as if *Salmaſius*, by *Perſona*, had meant a *Tyrant*, under the *Vizer*, or *Mask* of a King.

3. The Reaſon why *Milton* was ſo ſevere upon *Salmaſius*, was not ſo much becauſe *Salmaſius* uſed the Word Perſona, as becauſe he miſtook the *Ablative* for the *Accuſative* Caſe, and wrote *in Perſona*, when it ſhould have been *in Perſonam Regis*.

But, tho' *Salmaſius* gave a full Anſwer to every thing, that *Milton*, on this occaſion, Played upon him for, Inſtancing in ſeveral *Roman* Writers, who have taken the word *Perſona* in a proper Senſe, and have uſed the *Ablative Caſe*, as he has done; yet, it not being to my preſent Purpoſe, I ſhall only deſire to know of my Brother What Alliance *Chriſt's ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners has*, either with the *Natural Perſon* of a King; or of any other Man; or with a meer *Ficta Perſona*? For both theſe are very diſtinct from a *Moral*, or *Legal Perſon*; and, it is in this *Moral* or *Legal* Senſe, that the word [*Perſon*] is taken, when it's affirm'd, that *Chriſt ſuſtained the Perſon of Sinners*, and it ſignifieth the ſame with Chriſts being their Publick Repreſentative. He was *Publica Perſona moralis* Repreſentativa.

We will therefore, before we diſmiſs this *Phraſe*, conſult the Reverend Mr. *Alſop*, for I know my Brother hath a great conceit of him; who, in his *Antiſozzo*, *p.* 689. ſaith, That *Chriſt* is the Repreſentative of all his *Spiritual Seed*; and in *p.* 693. All the *Spiritual Seed* and *Poſterity* of Chriſt, are by Vertue of a *New* Law-conſtitution, made Righteous by the Righteouſneſs of their *Spiritual Head*, and Repreſentative: To whom I'le add what the Reverend Dr. *Bates* ſaith of it, which is, *that Chriſt was to be our* Repreſentative, *and therefore ſuch a Conjunction between him, and us, muſt be*

be, that God might esteem all his People to suffer in him; which is no more than what is affirmed in the Close of the first *Homily* of *Justification*, when it's said, 'That Christ is now the Righteousness of all them 'that truly do believe in him. He for them paid their 'Ransom by his death; He, for them, fulfilled the 'Law in his Life: So that *now in him, and by him, every 'True Christian may be called a* Fulfiller of the 'Law:

But if Christ *Represented Sinners* in his Death, he must be found in their Quality, suffering *as a Sinner*; that is, as Mr. *Alsop* has it, in his *Anti-Sozzo*, p. 184. 'That Christs Soul was made an Offering for sin, '*Isa.* 53. 10. Nay, *he was made* Sin *for us, tho' he knew 'no sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God 'in him*, 2 Cor. 21. And *Appearing* in this Quality; '*Death*, the Officer of Gods Violated Law, might '*Justly Arrest* him, and the Father be pleased to 'bruise him. For as elsewhere, the same Author, 'he was a *Sinner*, that is, by *Imputation*, pag. 574. 'Christ could no otherwise be a *Sinner*, but by im-'putation, nor we otherwise Righteous than by *Im-'putation.*

Thus, the Lord Christ Suffering and Obeying in the *Person of Sinners*, as their *Publick Representative*, it is to all intents and purposes as effectual, as if they had done it themselves *Personæ morales* Representativæ, *quæ* Personam aliorum Referant——*hujus vice negotia expediunt, eodem cum effectu, ac si ab* illo *ipso essent Confecta.* Pufend. ubi. sup. II.

What hath been urged on this Head, makes it Apparent, that the Phrase of *Christs sustaining the Person of Sinners*, in his Death and Obedience, is very Intelligible and Aptly used by the Orthodox; such as Dr. *Bates*, *Rutherford*, *Scherzerus*, *Quenstedius*, *Nowel*, *Essenius*, *Voetius*, *Rivetus*, and many others; ay, the very same thing is used by the Reverend Mr. *Alsop*, in

in his insisting so very much on Christs being a Representative, who is one that *sustain the Person of them he Represents*: However, it's rejected and exposed to scorn and contempt, by *this Brother*, who thereby doth, in this instance, prove the Reports to be *True*; For, it being affirmed in the *Report*, that this Phrase of *Christs sustaining our Person*, is Rejected by them; you see it to be so, and the Reason assigned is, because it *could not bear a sound sense*, but is *lyable to be Interpreted to a sense of Malignity to the whole of the Gospel.*

III. *A Commutation or Change of Persons between Christ and us, is Denyed.*

The Paper sent by some *Presbyterian* Brethren unto the Congregational, intimating, that the *Author of Gospel Truth Stated*, had denyed *a Commutation or Change of Persons between Christ and us*; the Reverend Brethren, who meet at *Little St. Helens*, delivered their Opposite Sense thus, 'It is manifest, that 'when Mr. *Williams* useth the Phrase [*of no Change of 'Persons between Christ and us*] it could not be intended, 'as a denyal of *a Change of Persons between Christ and 'us*, in the general Sense.

But what thinks my Reverend Brother of this? It appears clear enough to me, that he is of Opinion, *That Mr.* Ws. *doth deny a Change of Persons between Christ and us, in every Sense.* And yet on the other hand, he seems to argue, as if Mr. *Ws.* held a Change of Persons between Christ and us, in some Sense, which is Evident from what he saith of a *Change* and no Change; [tho' he had little Reason to speak of *no Change*, seeing he is the man that is given so much to *Change*] and his falling so severely upon the *Reporter*, for suggesting, that Mr. *Ws.* Denyed *a Change of Persons between Christ and us, in every Sense?* For he very triumphantly tells us,

Faithful

'Mr. *Ws.* did not deny a Change of Perſon, *ſimpliciter, ſed ſecundum quid*; not univerſally, but reſtrictively; for the moſt univerſal Terms are not always *univerſally* to be underſtood. pag. 38.

Reply.

1. This Paragraph of my Reverend Brother, in Connection with what precedes, and follows it, doth, I confeſs, look as if he held, that Mr. *Ws.* did not deny a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, in the general ſenſe: And for once we will ſuppoſe it, and ſee how agreeable this Notion is with his way of arguing on this occaſion, which is thus,

2. Mr. *Ws.* did not deny a *Change of Perſon ſimpliciter, ſed ſecundum quid*, not *univerſally* but *reſtrictively*. Well then; on this ſuppoſal, what follows? Becauſe Mr. *Ws.* did not deny a *Change of Perſon, ſimpliciter*, and *univerſally*, therefore muſt he be for a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, *ſecundum quid*, & *reſtrictively*? Yes; It muſt be ſo. How then ſhall we Conciliate this Notion with what is in pag. 9. in which place he thus expreſſeth himſelf; 'Where lies the neceſſity, that becauſe there was a *Change of Chriſts Perſon for ſinners*, there muſt be a *Change of Perſon between Chriſt and ſinners*? This Paſſage makes it evident, that in the Judgment of my Brother, theſe two Phraſes [*A Change of Chriſts Perſon for ſinners*;] and [*a Change of Perſon between Chriſt and ſinners*] are ſo very different, and in their Meaning ſo Remote from each other, that from the Aſſerting the one, the other cannot be neceſſarily inferred. How then can, ſay I, theſe two Paſſages be Conciliated? Mr. *Ws.* muſt hold a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, ſecundum quid*, becauſe he doth not *ſimply and univerſally deny a Change of Chriſts Perſon*; and yet there lyes no neceſſity, that becauſe there is a *Change of Chriſts Perſon for us*, there *muſt be a Change of Perſons between*

tween Chriſt and Us? How ſhall we ſet theſe things together? Or, find in our Brothers Arguings a Defence of the Brethren at *Little St. Hellens?* It muſt be thus or not at all, that I can ſee. Mr. *Ws.* doth not deny a *change of Chriſt's Perſon* Simply and Univerſally, therefore in ſome reſpect he muſt be for a *change of Perſon between Chriſt and Us.* That is to ſay, tho' a Man may hold a *change of Chriſt's Perſon*, without holding a *change of Perſons between Chriſt* and Us, in any ſenſe; yet Mr. *Ws.* muſt be for a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, in ſome ſenſe, becauſe he doth not deny a *change of Chriſt's Perſon ſimply*, and *in every ſenſe.* He muſt own that the Apoſtle *Peter* was a good man, in ſome reſpect, becauſe he doth not ſay, that St. *Paul* was Evil in every reſpect. The Connection between a *change of Chriſt's Perſon*, and a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, is, in the Judgment of my Brother, no other than what is between the Piety of the one Apoſtle, and the Infirmities of the other. But,

3. My Brother is in good earneſt, only for a *change of Chriſt's Perſon*, without a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, as I will ſoon prove, ſo that all this noiſe about a *change of Chriſt's Perſon ſecundum quid*, and *Reſtrictively*, is nothing to the purpoſe. The queſtion is not, *whether there be a change of Chriſt's Perſon for Sinners?* No *Socinian* will deny thus much. But, *whether there be a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Sinners?* The Brethren at St. *Hellens* ſay, There is a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*; at leaſt in the general ſenſe, and they thought, that Mr. *Ws.* held ſo too. But, if we may Judge of Mr. *Ws.* by his Defender, its notorious, that Mr. *Ws. doth not hold a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, in any ſenſe. That this phraſe is of a late contrivance, and muſt have a *Blaſphemous* ſenſe, as I will ſhew from my Brothers own words.

Faith-

Faithful Rebuke.

'The Controverſie lieth in ſome School Terms, 'or *Jargons* of Art, of a very late Contrivance, ſuch 'as a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us.* p. 30.

Reply.

1. This contemptuous Treatment, with which my Brother entertains this phraſe, (which as it has been long ago uſed by the Church of God; ſo is it moſt apt to expreſs that great Truth, delivered in the Holy Scriptures, where it's ſaid, *Chriſt died for us*) can indicate nothing leſs than that He *Believes not a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us.*

2. He ſaith, that it is a phraſe of a *very late contrivance*, and a *School* Term, whereas the learned Dr. *Owen* hath prov'd it to have been uſed by the *Fathers*, ſuch as St. *Auſtin*, St. *Chryſoſtome*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Juſtin Martyr*, long before the *Schoolmen* had their riſe. *Owen* of *Juſtif.* p. 41, *&c.* and *Witſius* proves it too.

My Brother goeth on to aſſure us, that this phraſe, of a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, muſt have a *Blaſphemous ſenſe.*

Faithful Rebuke.

'Let us Examine the phraſe: *A change of perſons 'between Chriſt and Us*; If I underſtood *Grammar*, the 'ſenſe muſt be, that *Chriſt was changed* for *us*; and we 'for *Chriſt*, the *change* muſt *be mutual*, and *Interchange-'able*. But though Chriſt *Redeemed us*; we never Re-'deemed Chriſt: Chriſt ſtood in our place, as our Re-'deemer, we never ſtood in his place, nor were his 'Redeemers: He Died *for us*, for our ſins; we ne-'never Died for *him*, for his ſins. *p.* 9.

Reply.

1. That my reverend Brother hath delivered himſelf, in a point of this Importance ſo haſtily, doth greatly leſſen him in the Eſteem of ſome of his trueſt Friends. For he is poſitive, that the phraſe of *a change*

of

of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, muſt ſignifie, that we Died for *Chriſt's ſins*, to Redeem him; Now, ſeeing this muſt *be* the *ſenſe* of the phraſe, I deſire to know, whether we did, in any ſenſe, *General*, or *Special*, Die for Chriſt's Sins? If this *muſt be* the ſenſe of the phraſe; except my Brother believes, that in ſome *ſenſe*, we did Die to Redeem Chriſt, he can't hold a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, in any ſenſe, and whatever my reverend Brethren in *Little St. Hellens* did *charitably* hope, it's now manifeſt from this *Rebuker*, that Mr. *Williams* by the phraſe [of *no change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*] did intend the denial of a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us in the *General* ſenſe. Yea farther,

2. That ſeeing my reverend Brethren at *St. Hellens* are for a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, they muſt, in the Opinion of the Rebuker, hold, that We Died for Chriſt's Sins, and Redeemed him, which is *Blaſphemy*. I wiſh my Brother would think a little on what he Aſſerts, when he ſo boldly avers, that the ſenſe *of a change of Perſons* between Chriſt and Us, *muſt be*, that we were *Chang'd for him*, ſo as *to Die for his Sins*: Never did a *Socinus*, a *Crellius*, or any raſh *Engliſh Unitarian* charge this phraſe, and the generality of the Reformed, with more than Blaſphemy. But,

3. Where is the man, that ever gave ſuch a ſenſe of this phraſe? The learned *Witſius* is perſuaded, 'That never any one, who underſtood Divinity, no, 'not a Man in *his Wits*, did ever Dream of ſuch a 'Permutation of Perſons, as that, which places the 'Saviour amongſt *the ſaved*. *Iren. Animad. cap.* 2. §. 8. And ſure I am, that *Crellius*, tho' he faſtned a wrong ſenſe upon the word *Surrogation*, 'twas not ſuch a *Blaſphemous* one. For, when he ſaith, 'There is not 'a *proper Surrogation* in *Chriſt's Dying for us*, It is '(ſaith he) becauſe a *proper Surrogation* muſt be ſuch a

'*Commutation of Perſons*, that the ſubſtituted perſons, 'in all reſpects, to be in the ſame *place*, and *ſtate*, 'wherein the other was, and if it refers to *Sufferings*, 'then it is when one *ſuffers the very ſame*, which the 'other was to ſuffer, he being immediately delivered 'by the others ſuffering. But in anſwer unto *Crellius* it's cleared, That to endure the ſame Puniſhment in all reſpects, is not neceſſary to a *proper Surrogation*. 'That, if *David*, (as the Biſhop of *Worceſter* has it) 'had obtain'd his wiſh, that he had Died for his Son 'Abſolom, it had not been neceſſary in order to his 'Sons Eſcape, that he had *hanged by the Hair of his* 'Head, as *his Son*; but his *Death*, tho' in other *cir-* 'cumſtances, had been ſufficient. And therefore, 'when the Lawyers ſay, *ſubrogatum ſapit naturam* 'ejus, *in cujus Locum ſubrogatur* : *Coverruvias* tells us, 'it is to be underſtood *ſecundum primordialem* natu-'ram, *non ſecundum accidentalem*; from whence it ap-'pears, that all *circumſtances* are not neceſſary to be 'the ſame in *Surrogation*, but that the *Nature* of the 'Puniſhment remain. Diſcourſ. of Chriſt's ſuff. Ed. 2. p. 324. But where is the man, who at any time ſaid that a *Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, muſt ſignifie, that as Chriſt ſuffered for us, ſo we ſuffered for Chriſt. There is a Commutation between a Surety and the Debtor, which is when the Surety, ſuſtaining the Perſon of the Debtor, pays his Debts for him; but muſt this phraſe of a change of Perſons between the Surety and the Debtor, ſignifie, that the Debtor pays the Debts of his Surety? Is it not ſufficient, that it ſignifieth, that on the Sureties coming into the ſame Bonds with the Debtor, and Paying the Debt he owed, the Debtor be thereby delivered? The ſame may be truly ſaid of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, for he being our Surety, took on him our Perſon, ſo that there was a change of Perſons between him and us, He paid the Debt

we

we owed, that we might be delivered. Not that we Paid any Debts for Christ, for he owed none. But the *Term Surety* is also rejected, as what can't bear a sound sense; which may further assure us, That a Change *of Person between Christ and Us*, is denied in the general sense. Once more,

4. As the phrase of a *change of Persons between Christ and Us* is entirely denied, in like manner a New Phrase of a Change of Christs Person is invented, and put into its place. Tho' what to make of it my Brother is at a loss; and when He goes about to explain it, he is miserably confounded.

Faithful Rebuke.

'This phrase, the Change of the Person of Christ, 'may have, and truly has an Honest, and sound sense, 'in which it may be of some good Use to Explain 'the Doctrines of *Satisfaction*, and *Justification*; and 'it is that which the *R. R. the Bishop* of *Worcester*, 'with *Grotius* against *Crellius* do put upon it, *Reas. of* 'Christ's *Suffer. Edit.* 1. p. 144. viz. The *Substitution* 'of *One Person in the room of another*, &c. *p.* 44.

Reply.

1. There is, saith he, an Honest sense of this phrase, [the *change of Christs Person*] hath, and it is that, which the R. R. the Bishop of *Worcester*, with *Grotius* against *Crellius* put upon it. He should have said what *Grotius*, with the Bishop of *Worcester* against *Crellius* put upon it; for, tho' *Crellius* wrote against *Grotius*, and the Bishop against *Crellius*, yet *Grotius* never wrote against *Crellius*.

2. What sense did these great Men put upon this phrase, of a *change of Christs person*? I can't conceive how they should put any sense upon it, for, 'twas not known, when they wrote on Christ's Satisfaction, nor ever invented till the Gentleman, who engaged my Brother to enter upon this sorrowful Undertaking, started it. And to speak the Truth, 'tis a phrase on-

ly adjuſted to expreſs no more than what the *Socinians* do conſtantly grant; for they ſay it again and again, that Chriſt, tho' he ſuffered not the *Puniſhment* due to us for ſin, yet he endured Grievous and Dolorous Pains, which is aptly enough expreſſed, when it's ſaid there was a *change of Chriſt's Perſon for us*, for he was, ſay theſe Hereticks, Changed *from Eaſe to Pain for our Good*. However,

3. My Brother will have it, that the Biſhop hath put a ſound ſenſe upon this phraſe, *viz. It is the Subſtitution of one Perſon into the room of another*. Doth the Biſhop give this Interpretation of the phraſe of a change of Chriſt's Perſon? Or, doth he not rather think, that there can be no Subſtitution of one Perſon into the room of another, without a *change of Perſon* between *that One, and the other?* Thus much undoubtedly he holds. But to Inſinuate, that this great Man and *Grotius* are for a change of Chriſt's Perſon, without a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, and make that *change of Chriſt's Perſon* to ſignifie a *Subſtitution* of Chriſt in our room, is to repreſent 'em to be ſuch *Self-contradictors*, as indeed, my Brother and his Principal are. A *change of Chriſt's* Perſon, without a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, muſt be a *Change* without a *Subſtitution*, for a Subſtitution there cannot be without a change of *Perſons* between one, and another. To affirm that Chriſt was Subſtituted into our Place and Room, and at the ſame time to deny a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, is to Say, and Unſay.

That I may therefore clear the Truth in this Inſtance, and Vindicate theſe learned Men from the charge of denying a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, and of affirming a *Subſtitution of Chriſt into* our room, I will give you their own words on this Subject, and add to them what the great *Turretine* ſaith of the phraſe of a *change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*.

1. That

1. That *Grotius* is for a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, I mean ſuch a Change of Perſons between the one and the other, as is more than only a *Change* of a *Perſon*. For, 1. *Grotius* his word is *Commutation*, which imports, that what is changed hath an eſſential reſpect to the Change of another, whether it be meant of *Things* or *Perſons*, the Commutation muſt ſignifie more than the Change either of one thing, or of one Perſon, it muſt be between Thing and Thing; or between Perſon and Perſon; Or, as *Crellius* ſaith, between a Thing and a Perſon: Tho' there may be a Change of one thing only, or of one Perſon; yet, a Commutation of *one* thing; or of *one* Perſon only is an Implication. 2. The Change, *Grotius* ſpeaks of, is ſuch a Change, as is *per ſucceſſionem*, where one goeth out of the place and another comes into it, which cannot poſſibly be, if the Change be only of one. 'As often (ſaith *Grotius*) as the Præpoſition 'Αντὶ, [*For*] is applied to *Perſons*, it ſignifieth the *coming of one into the room and place of another by Succeſſion*. 'Thus *Archelaus* is ſaid to Reign 'Αντὶ Ἡρῴδου [*For Herod*] 'That is, He Succeeded *Herod* in the Throne. —— 'Socinus, when preſſed, dares not deny, that 'Αντὶ πολλῶν '[*For many*] doth ſignifie a Commutation. —— We 'were *Debitores mortis*, from this *debt* we were diſcharg'ed by *Chriſts* giving ſomewhat, to give ſomewhat, that 'by it, we may be diſcharged, is to *Pay* or *Satisfie*. This *Phraſe* therefore, δοῦναι ἀντὶ πολλῶν [*To give for many*] doth always ſignifie a *True Commutation*; not a *Metaphorical One*, as *Socinus* without any Preſident affirms. —— 'Αντὶ, *For*, doth neceſſarily denote a Commutation. *Grot. de Satiſ. Cap. 9.*

Here's not a word of the *Change of one Perſon* only; it being a Commutation, which is a *Change between one Perſon and another*, that *Grotius* ſpeaks of, where he, who owed nothing, is come into the place of the Debtor, and paying the debt, the Debtor is diſcharged,

ged, and thereby brought into a ſtate of Liberty and Freedom. Here is, I ſay, a *Commutation*, or *Change of Perſons*, which in ſome reſpect is *mutual*, but not in all reſpects ſo; It is, as the Learned Dr. *Owen* has it, a *Commutation, or Change of Perſons* between Chriſt and us, as to *ſin* and *Righteouſneſs*, whence Chriſt is made *our ſin*, and they, who believe, are made the Righteouſneſs of God in Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

2. The Right Reverend the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, who, in his Defence of *Grotius*, againſt *Crellius*, hath very Clearly ſtated the Controverſie between the Orthodox and the *Socinians*, and given the true ſenſe of *Grotius*; is very particular and diſtinct in his Aſſerting and Explaining the Doctrine of a *Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, in theſe words, 'In the matter 'of Redemption, or where ἀντὶ is uſed, *Crellius* will 'by no means yield, that there was a Commutation 'of Perſons between Chriſt and us; but all the 'Commutation he will allow here, is only a *Commu-* 'tation between a *Thing* or a *Price* and a *Perſon*; which 'he therefore aſſerts, *that ſo there may* be no neceſſity 'of Chriſts *undergoing* the Puniſhment *of ſin*, in *order to* '*Redemption*, becauſe the *Price* that is paid, is not ſup-'poſed to undergo the Condition of the *Perſon Deli-* 'vered by it; which will evidently appear to have 'no force at all, in caſe we can prove, that a *Proper* 'Redemption may be obtained by the *Puniſhment* of *one* 'in the *room of another*; for that *Puniſhment* then comes 'to be the λύτρον, or *Price* of Redemption, and he 'that pays this, muſt be ſuppoſed to undergo *Puniſh-* 'ment for it: ſo that the Commutation being 'between the one and the other, Redeemed by it, here 'is a Proper Commutation of Perſons implied in 'the *Payment of the price*. Diſc. *of Chriſts ſuffer. Ed.* 2. 'pag. 325.

In theſe words the Learned Biſhop is very full in aſſerting a Proper Commutation *of Perſons between*

Chriſt

Christ and us; That whereas *Crellius* denied a *Commutation of Persons* that there might *be no necessity* of Christs undergoing the Punishment of sin, in order to Redemption, the Bishop doth with clearness detect his subtilty; and Learnedly Confute him, making it to appear, that those places of Scripture, where λύτρον, and ἀντὶ are joyned together, do prove a Commutation, not of a price for a Person, but of *one Person for another*; or which is the same, a *substitution of one Person in the room of another*; for, these Phrases, [*a Commutation of one Person for another*] and [*a substitution of one Person into the room of another*] as the Bishop and all others, acquainted with this Controversie, apprehend, do signifie so much the same thing, that whoever yields the one, can't in reason deny the other.

The Bishop, discoursing of *Expiatory Sacrifices*, clears it, that the *Jews* themselves understood כפר, *Capar*, to import such an Expiation as is made by the *substitution of one in the Place of another*, telling us, that *Buxturf* has collected many Instances, wherein *Capara* is taken by the *Rabinical Writers* for such an *Expiation*, whereby one was to undergo a *Punishment* in the place of another; And (saith the Bishop) 'I insist on these things, only to 'let us understand, that the *Jews* never understood '*Capar* in the sense our Adversaries contend for, 'when applyed to an *Expiatory Sacrifice*, but as im-'plying a Commutation and a Substitution *of one in* 'the place of another, so as by the punishment of *that*, 'the *other* in whose room *he* suffers, may obtain de-'liverance. Of *Christs Suffer.* p. 359. 360. Here you see a Commutation and a Substitution do go together, and as the Bishop adds, *Which is the sense we plead for.*

The thing is so very clear, that my Brother could never have mis-represented these Great Men thus, nor indeed have himself fallen into this mistake, if he had not used the word, without framing in his

Mind an Idea of its Import. If he had taken the Phraſe of a *Subſtitution of one Perſon into the Room of another*, in the Common Senſe of the Words, he could not but obſerve, a *Commutation, or Change of Perſons between the one and the other*, and that if the Change had been but of *one*, of the Subſtituted Perſon only, there could be no room for him to be placed in, that is, there could be no *Subſtitution*.

In a word, from what I have inſiſted on it's manifeſt, that the Learned Biſhop is moſt expreſs in aſſerting a *Proper Commutation, or Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*: So that my Reverend Brother, when he ſuggeſts the contrary, doth really miſ-repreſent and abuſe the Biſhop. But

3. The Learned *Turretine*, who is acknowledged by all to have written of Chriſts Satisfaction with as much clearneſs, and ſtrength as moſt Men, is very large in his Defence of a *Commutation, or Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, againſt *Socinus* and *Crellius*. 'For (ſaith he) ſeeing our Salvation may be con-'ſidered under a fourfold Reſpect; (1.) With reſpect 'to *God, Judging*. (2.) As to *Chriſt, Redeeming*, and 'ſo there is a *Permutation*, becauſe Chriſt is made *ſin*, 'and a Curſe for us, that we might be the bleſſed of 'God in him. *De Satiſ. par.* 1. *Diſp.* 3. § 29. And in the following *Diſputation*, § 5. 'When it's ſaid *Mat.* '20. 28. *Chriſt gave himſelf a Ranſom for many*, the 'præpoſition *ἀντὶ Communiſſimè, & maximè propriè ſubſtitutionem, & Commutationem deſignat*; this præpoſition [*For*] doth moſt frequently and properly denote a Subſtitution and Commutation: And this Great Man adds, '*Crellius* againſt *Grotius*, inſinuates, that we are 'deceived in thinking, that there is a *Commutation* 'between *Chriſt and us*, in the controverted Places, as 'if, when we were to give our ſouls, Chriſt *in our* '*Place gave his Soul*, the Commutation is only between 'a *Thing* and a *Perſon*; between a Price, that is, the

'Soul

'Soul and Life *of Christ, and us*, as Captives and 'Slaves, but who did ever ſay, that *Chriſts blood was* 'ſubrogated *for us, and came into our Place*. To this of *Crellius, Turretine* thus anſwers, 'That whilſt he 'endeavours to deceive others, he himſelf is moſt 'ſhamefully deluded, for theſe are not *our words ſed verba Scripturæ*, but it is the Scripture, *quæ* Communtatio-'nem illam inter Chriſtum & nos *ſtatuit, dum expreſſè dicit Chriſtum ſeipſum dediſſe pro multis*, which 'direct to this Communtation, *or Change between Chriſt and us*; when it's ſaid ſo expreſly, that *Chriſt gave himſelf for many*, Mat. 20. 28, *&c.*

This *Phraſe of a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, is, in the Judgment of the Learned *Turretine*, a *Scripture Phraſe*, intended by Chriſt himſelf when it's ſaid, *He gave himſelf* [*For*] *many*. I might give a large Catalogue of other Authorities, but, that this is the Doctrine, commonly received by *Proteſtants*, is ſo manifeſt, that whoever hath any tollerable Acquaintance with their Writings, cannot but be convinced of the Truth of what I do herein affirm, much more ſhould he, who has received a Commiſſion from all the *Syſtematical Divines* of *Germany*, the *Voluminous Tigurines* and *Bulky Low-Dutch*, and with thoſe few that are left in *England*, be ſufficienty inſtructed in the Knowledge of ſuch a Plain and Common Truth.

Theſe things then have been cleared that my *Rebuker* doth untruly repreſent the *Phraſe of a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, to be a *Jargon* of Art; of a *very late Contrivance*; that can't bear a ſound ſenſe, but muſt ſignifie *Blaſphemy*; That he, or his *guide*, has invented a *New Phraſe of a Change of Chriſts Perſon*; that he has Unrighteouſly Charged *Grotius* and the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, for uſing it, that the ſenſe he feigns them to put upon it is inconſiſtent with his *denying* a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us; And,

And, do he what he can, he muſt ſplit either on a *Contradiction*; or on *Blaſphemy*, or both.

Thus you ſee whither my Brothers *Heats*, or ſomewhat elſe has hurryed him.

But it's urged, that tho' a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, is denyed; yet ſo long as it's owned, that the Lord Chriſt *ſuffered in our Place and Stead*, the *Truth is ſecured.*

Faithful Rebuke.

'I would a thouſand times ſooner chuſe to adhere 'to this Phraſe, Chriſt ſuffered, and dyed in our 'Stead and *Place* [*Loco noſtro, vice noſtrâ*] than to that 'other; In the ſufferings of Chriſt, there was a 'Change of *Perſons* between *Chriſt and us*; for the 'former has had its ſignification ſtrongly fixed, and 'ſettled by long Uſage, and Præſcription: Whereas 'this latter is but of Yeſterday, and ſcarce two Per'ſons, no, not the Inventors agreed amongſt them'ſelves, what ſenſe to ſtamp upon it. Again, the plaineſt 'Chriſtians have a tolerable underſtanding of the 'former, whereas the other does but Amuſe and Con'found them. p. 37.

Reply.

1. If Mr. *Ws.* had taken this Phraſe [*in our place and ſtead*] in it's Antient and Genuine Senſe, it would have argued, that he was ſound in the Faith, and that his rejecting the Phraſe of a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, would have been only an evincement of his want of Learning, and that he underſtood not the Controverſie he wrote of.

2. That, if this had been the Caſe, the Reverend Brethren, at *Little St. Hellens*, would have been in the Right, when they ſaid, Mr. *Ws.* cannot be underſtood to deny a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, in the *general* ſenſe becauſe he uſes the Phraſe of Chriſts ſuffering in our place and ſtead, which doth ſignifie a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us.* But

3. He

3. He who wrote the *Report*, had, it's like, ſome Reaſons, moving him to ſuſpect Mr. *Ws.* that as he did (whether in ignorance or knowingly, I ſay not) concur with *Socinus* and *Crellius*, in denying a *Proper Commutation, or Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*; ſo he did with ſome high *Arminians*, and the *Engliſh Unitarians*, impoſe a wrong ſenſe on the *Phraſe of* Chriſts ſuffering in our Place and Stead, who intend by it no more than that Chriſt ſuffered for our good, in which ſenſe it doth not, I confeſs, imply a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us; nor can the Uſe of it be ſufficient to prove, that he who doth expreſly deny a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, doth hold a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, which was the thing the Reporter preſſed. And now the Rebuker has made manifeſt.

4. That the Phraſe of Chriſts ſuffering in our place and ſtead, is not taken by them in the ſenſe of the Reformed, for as it's ſet up in contradiſtinction to a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, ſo it's made to ſignifie no more than for our good, for which reaſon the next Charge is,

IV. *That an Heterodox Senſe is Impoſed on the Phraſe of* Chriſts ſuffering in our Place and Stead.

'There are, ſaith *Turretine*, ſeveral Texts of Scrip-'ture, in which 'tis aſſerted, *That Chriſt dyed* for us, '*Rom.* 8. 32. *Rom.* 5. 6, 8. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Heb.* 11. 9. '*Mat.* 20. 28. Theſe and many other ſuch Texts, do 'either bear but a *Frigid*, and *Jejune ſenſe*; *or muſt* '*neceſſarily import ſuch a ſurrogation*, as ſignifieth, that 'Chriſt did undergo the moſt curſed Death, not only '*bono, & Commodo noſtro*, for *our good and profit*, But 'moreover, *vice ac Loco noſtro*, in *our place and ſtead*. De Satiſf. par. 1. Diſput. 4. Theſ. 2.

Dr. *Edwards*, in the Second Part of his *Preſervative* againſt

againſt *Socinianiſm*, having aſſerted, 'That our bleſ-
'ſed Saviour by dying and ſhedding his blood, under-
'went that puniſhment, and ſubmitted to that Con-
'demnation, which our ſins had otherwiſe rendred
'us, inevitably obnoxious to; and this being in it
'ſelf a *Sufficient Compenſation* made to the Juſtice of
'God, for the Affronts and Injuries offered to his
'Authority by the violation of his Laws; and likewiſe
'being accepted of by him as ſuch: It muſt *from hence*
'*neceſſarily and naturally* be effectual to procure for us
'*Pardon*, and Impunity. The Dr. having aſſerted
thus much, he adds, '*Now this being a matter of great*
'*Conſequence, upon which the* whole ſtreſs of the Con-
'troverſie between us, and our Adverſaries *Leans* and
'*Reſts*, I ſhall a little further enlarge upon it, and en-
'deavour to make out theſe *two Things*, 1. That
'Chriſt dyed for our ſakes, and that not only as it ſigni-
'fies for our Benefit and Advantage, but in our room
'and ſtead, p. 94.

What the Dr. hath in this place declared is nothing elſe than what the Orthodox univerſally do, in their Oppugning the *Socinian* Hereſie, in this great Point; For they all hold, that as the Phraſe, in *our room and ſtead*, ſignifyeth *ſomewhat more* than *for our good*, ſo it points us to *that* upon which the whole ſtreſs of the Controverſie between us and them doth Lean.

But what is this ſomewhat more? I anſwer,

Turretine, ſpeaking of Chriſts Suffering *vice noſtrâ*, in our place and ſtead, explains it thus, 'Chriſt, as
'*our Surety* ſuffered what we had deſerved, that by
'making a full ſatisfaction to Divine Juſtice, we
'might be delivered from eternal Death, and being
'delivered, might moreover, be made partakers of
'eternal Life.

To ſuffer, you ſee, *vice noſtrâ*, in *our ſtead*, is in the Judgment of this great Man, to ſuffer as our *Surety*, and who knoweth not, that a *Surety* is ſubſtituted into

into the room of the Debtor; that between the one and the other there is a *Commutation*, or *Change of Persons*, besides, sustinere vicem *nostram* is the same with *sustinere personam nostram*; to suffer *in our stead* the same with suffering in *our Person*. Further,

This phrase [*vice nostrâ*, *in our Stead*] is used to interpret that other phrase, [*For us*] what is done *for us*, is done in *our stead*.

When it's said in Scripture, that Christ suffered [*for us*,] the meaning is, that Christ suffered [*in our stead*,] and that [*For us*] doth denote a *Commutation*, or change of Persons between Christ and Us, I have already shewn out of *Grotius*, the Bishop of *Worcester*, and *Turretine* about the Import of the *Præposition ὑπὲρ*, [*For*.]

But in Scripture it's also said, that Christ Died for *our sins*; and for *sinners*, and the Controversie between *Us*, and the *Socinians*, is, whether [*for our sins*] must be considered as Importing a Final, or the Impulsive and Meritorious Cause, of Christ's sufferings? Now Dr. *Edwards* gives the sense of the Orthodox, when He affirms that all those phrases of Dying *for sins*, and *sinners*, plainly denote to us, that sin in those places, is not to be considered as the Final, but as the *Impulsive Meritorious Cause*; But the *Socinians* will have it, that [*for us*] and [for *our sins*] denote only a *Final Cause*, and *signifie* no more than for *our good*.

However my reverend Brother, for reasons best *known unto himself*, is express, that the phrase of Christ's suffering in our *Stead*, *doth signifie no more than for our* Good, Ay, that it's *Impossible* it should signifie *any more*.

Faithful Rebuke.

'He that by Christ's suffering in our stead, intends 'He suffered *for our good* speaks the *Truth*. p. 37.

'But the Caviller proceeds; in our place and stead '(with

'(with some) signifie no more than for our good; 'why 'tis Impossible they should. p. 35.

Reply.

What *English Unitarian* can more positively declare, that it is Impossible for the phrase [*in our Place, and Stead*] to signifie *any more* than *for our good* than my Brother has done? And if it can signifie no more than for *our good*, wherein can he, who is of this Opinion, distinguish himself from a *Socinian*, when he denies a change of Persons to *be between Christ and Us*, by saying, that Christ Died in our *Place* and *Stead*? For, whilst he saith Christ suffered in *our Stead*, according to this declaration, he must mean no more than that Christ suffered *for our good*, which may be without His making satisfaction to God's Justice for us. Alas Sirs! If you will allow us no sense of the phrase of a *change of Persons between Christ and Us*, but that we Died for Christ's sins, this is *Blasphemy*, when yet, if there be not a change of Persons between Christ and Us, there cannot be a *Substitution* of Christ's Person into our room, and consequently Christ did not, and could not suffer in our *place* and *stead*, which is, He did not, he could not make satisfaction, a *Real*, *Proper*, and *Full* Satisfaction unto God's Justice for us.

Here is the very natural and irrefragable Consequence which flows from my Brother's denying, a *change of Persons between Christ and Us*. For (I say) if Christ suffered not in *our stead*, He could not make *Satisfaction for us*, as all will grant. If there was not a *Substitution* of Christ into our place, He *suffered not in our place*, and if there was not a *change of Persons between Christ and Us*, there could not be a *Substitution of Christ into* our place.

But you'l say, that this is a remote Consequence, which ought not to be charged on my Brother; well then, we will let it for once pass so; and see whether

whether He is for Christ's ſuffering *in our ſtead*, here our Enquiry is not about the *word*, without a *meaning*; nor with a *wrong Senſe*. But, whether as it ſignifies ſomewhat more than *for our good*; it may be ſaid, that Chriſt ſuffered in *our ſtead*? To which my Brother doth directly anſwer, That when it's ſaid Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead, it's Impoſſible it ſhould ſignifie any *more than for our Good*: So clear it is, that how honeſtly ſoever my Brother may mean, his *Words* do in this place Expreſs a Denial of Chriſt's Satisfaction; as openly as the Engliſh *Unitarians* have ventured to do; And yet he doth ſay, that the *Socinians*, when they uſe this phraſe, do it *Knaviſhly*.

Faithful Rebuke.

'I had rather have the *Socinians* ſpeak honeſtly, 'tho' with a *Knaviſh* meaning, than mean, and ſpeak, 'both like *Knaves* ——— If the *Socinians* will put an '*Unſound* ſenſe upon *ſound* words, will you quit the 'ſound phraſe, becauſe they put a *wretched Senſe* on't? p. 35.

Reply.

1. I am willing to think my Brothers *Wit* hath prov'd a Snare to him in this place. For, if he be in good earneſt in any ſenſe, tho' but comparatively, for honeſt words with a *Knaviſh* meaning, 'twill induce ſome to ſuſpect, that whilſt he ſeems ſo zealous for the honeſt phraſe of Chriſt's *ſuffering in our ſtead*, he hath pitch'd upon the *Socinian*, which he calls the *Knaviſh*, meaning deliberately, and of choice; And that of Inclination and Deſign he doth too often ſo ſpeak, and ſo write.

2. Whatever my Brother intends, it's manifeſt, that whilſt he calls the *Socinian* ſenſe *Unſound*, *Wretched* and *Knaviſh*, He gives the very ſenſe of this phraſe, which the *Socinians*, who uſe it, do give; and by it means (if we may judge his meaning by his *words*) no more than what *Socinus*, *Crellius*, and that *Fraternity*,

Fraternity, do consistently with their Denial of Christ's Satisfaction, constantly grant. But must we quit a sound phrase, when ever an Unsound sense is put upon it?

3. There is no need of quitting the phrase. An *Orthodox* Explanation will be sufficient to Obviate what mischiefs are likely to arise from their wretched Interpretations; which is the true reason, why I am so much concern'd in this affair, and press so much for the Use of these Orthodox Terms and Phrases in their sound sense. For,

4. It hath been the Practice of some to reject the *Use* of such phrases, as have been pitch'd upon by the Godly Learned, and are most apt to express the Truth in the Controverted Points; and when for their Interest to continue their Use, then insiduously to foist in a wretched sense on them; chiefly for this reason, that they may make the *Sufferings* of Christ to be but an *Act* of *Dominion*; and not *properly Pœnal*; they, as well as all others knowing that if Christ's Sufferings be not properly a Punishment, they cannot be *satisfactory* to *God's Justice* for our sins; and if Christ did not so suffer in our Place and Stead, as [in *our Place* and *Stead*] signifie somewhat more than for our good, His sufferings were not properly Pœnal. And, agreeably hereunto, my Brother as he Rejects the phrases of Christ's *sustaining the Person of sinners*; *of a change of Persons between Christ and Us*, and puts an *Unsound* sense on *Christ's suffering* in *our Place* and *Stead*; so that word, which was in the *first Paper*, to make it evident, that we esteemed Christ's Sufferings to be a *proper Punishment* is rejected, as what can't in my Brothers Opinion bear a sound sense, which brings me to the fifth charge.

V. *Christ's Undertaking to Answer for sinners, the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works*, is turn'd into

into *Christ's Answering for our Violation of the Law of Works.* To this my Brother Replies.

Faithful Rebuke.

'What is the *Nice* difference then between 'Christ's *Answering* for our *Violation of the* Law; and *Answering* for us *the Violation?* Or, what the *Critical* 'difference between Christ's answering for them the 'Violation; and Answering for their Violation of 'the Law of Works: He that Answers for me the 'Violation of the Law, Answers for my Violation 'of the Law. p. 47.

Reply.

1. That Christ suffered *for our sins*, that is, *for our* Violation of the Law, the *Socinians* always acknowledge, but then they are so honest as to tell us, that the Præposition [*For*] in this Instance denotes only a *Final cause*, and that the meaning of the *phrase* of Christ's suffering for our Violations of the Law is the same with that other of Christ's suffering *for our good*; for which reason the yielding no more than that Christ suffered for our Violation of the Law of Works, cannot be a Bar against *Socinian* Encroachments, nor a sufficient security to the Truth of *Christ's Satisfaction.*

2. My Brother doth in this place make a sad noise about Answering for our Violation of the Law of Works, making close Enquiry, where the *Nice* difference between *for our*, and *for us*; and the *Critical* difference between *for them*, and *for their* closing his Enquiry with a but this it is to be *Hypercriticks in Theology*, when it's often ridiculous *in Philology*, whereas a Grain of Common Sense would have help'd him to understand, that here is not one word in all his *Nice* and *Critical* Disquisitions to the purpose, and that it was not about the difference between *for ours*, and *for us*, for *them* and for *their*, but that

the ſtreſs of what the Reporter ſuggeſted on this occaſion leans on the word [*Obligation.*] In the firſt Paper it was, that the Lord Chriſt did Anſwer for us the Obligations of the *Violated Law of Works*, and it muſt be obſerv'd, that by this phraſe an Effectual Proviſion was laid in againſt the moſt Rotten part of the *Socinian* Hereſie againſt *Chriſt's Satisfaction.* And the Enquiry, if to the purpoſe, ſhould have been, what the Nice Difference between anſwering for us the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works; and Anſwering *for our Violation of the Law of Works?* To which I anſwer;

3. There is a very great Difference, as great as is betwixt a *Goſpel Truth*, and a *Socinian Errour*, in an *Important Article* of the *Chriſtian Faith.*

To clear the Truth in this Point, I will refer you to the learned Biſhop of *Worceſter*, who truly delivers the ſenſe of the *Socinians* thus. 'They aſſert, 'That *God took occaſion by the ſins of Men to exerciſe* 'an *Act of Dominion upon Chriſt in his* ſufferings, and 'that the ſufferings of *Chriſt were intended for the ta-* 'king away the *ſins of men*; but they utterly deny, 'that the *ſufferings of Chriſt were to be conſidered, as a* 'Puniſhment *for ſin*, or *that Chriſt did ſuffer in our* 'place and *ſtead*; nay, they contend with great ve- 'hemency, *that it is wholly inconſiſtent with the Juſtice* 'of *God to make one mans ſins, the Meritorious Cauſe of* 'anothers *Puniſhment*; eſpecially *One wholly Innocent,* 'and ſo that the *Guilty ſhall be Freed on the account of his* 'ſufferings. Thus I have endeavoured to give the 'true ſtate of the Controverſie, with all Clearneſs 'and Brevity. And the ſubſtance of it will be re- 'duced to theſe two Heads.

Thus this learned Biſhop. The firſt Head of the two, being moſtly to my purpoſe, I'll only mention it and ſomewhat ſaid of it. It is this, 'Whether the ſuf- 'ferings of Chriſt in general are to be conſidered as

'a

'a Punishment of Sin, or as a meer act of *Dominion*? for that it must be one or the other of 'these two, cannot be denied by our Adversaries; 'for the Inflicting those Sufferings upon Christ, 'must either proceed from an *Anteceding Meritorious* 'Cause, or not. If they do, they are then *Punish-*'*ments*; if not, they are meer Exercises of Power 'and Dominion; whatever Ends they are Intended 'for and whatever Recompence be made for them. *Of Christs Suff.* p. 267.

Here then lies the Heart of the Controversie between us and them, whether *our sins be an Impulsive Meritorious Cause of Christ's sufferings*; and *Christ's sufferings a proper Punishment for our sins?* If our sins be the *Meritorious* Cause of Christ's sufferings, it necessarily follows, that Christ bore the *Punishment* of our sins in a *proper* sense.

An Impulsive Cause, in a remote sense, as though our sins *were a meer* Occasion of Christ's Dying *Crellius* granted. But as the Bishop observes, 'We Un-'derstand not an Impulsive Cause in so remote a 'sense, — but we contend for a *nearer* and more 'proper sense, *viz.* that the Death of Christ was '*primarily* intended for the Expiation of our sins, 'with a respect to *God*, and not to Us, and there-'fore our sins as an *Impulsive Cause* are to be consider-'ed as they are so displeasing to God, that it was ne-'cessary for the Vindication of God's Honour, and 'the deterring the World from sin, that no less a 'sacrifice of Attonement should be offered than the 'Blood of the Son of God. *Id. ibid.* p. 269.

And as they own a sort of an Anteceding Impulsive Cause, which is but the meer Occasion of Christ's sufferings, so they'll call Christ's sufferings a *Punishment*, but then they take Punishment only in an improper sense, *Panam improprie dictam fatemur.* So *Crellius*, For, saith He, 'What Christ suffered hath so near

'a Cognation and Alliance with *true Puniſhment*, that 'the word *Puniſhment*; and thoſe other *phraſes* uſed 'in deſcribing proper Puniſhments, may for the 'greater Elegancy be taken into our Diſcourſes 'about Chriſt's Paſſion. The Agreement there is be-'tween Chriſt's ſufferings and a proper Puniſhment 'is very conſiderable. Firſt in their *matter*, for both 'are afflictive, then in the *Impulſive Procatartic* 'cauſe: which is *ſin* in the ſenſe the Biſhop obſerved, 'and at laſt in the *Effect*, and *End*, which is to re-'move guilt, and bring men off from their ſins, tho' 'in the manner there is ſome difference. But then 'the great Difference is as to the *Formal Reaſon* of '*Puniſhment*, which not being found in Chriſt's ſuf-'ferings they can't be properly a Puniſhment. *Crel. Reſponſ. ad Grot. de ſatisf. ad cap.* 1.

Thus, what Approaches ſoever they ſeem to make towards the Truth, they utterly deny that ſin is in a proper ſenſe the Meritorious Cauſe of Chriſt's ſufferings; Or, that Chriſt's ſufferings are a proper Puniſhment.

There are amongſt the *Arminians* alſo, ſome who agree too much with the *Socinians* in denying Chriſt's ſufferings to be properly a Puniſhment, they holding them to be rather *Dolorous* than *Pœnal*, who are juſtly called *Socinianizing-Arminians*; ſuch as *Epiſcopius*, *Carcellæus*, and *Limborch*, who do their utmoſt to corrupt the Doctrine of Chriſt's *Satisfaction*. They own that Chriſt was *Puniſhed Loco noſtro*, in our Place and Stead, and yet deny his *Sufferings* to be *properly Pœnal*, allowing 'em to be but *Improperly*, or *Analogically* a *Puniſhment*. That the ſufferings of Chriſt, as to the Reaſon of the thing, were a Natural Evil, endured for Sin, as ſin was the Occaſion, or remote Cauſe, and may be aptly enough called Puniſhment. But they would rather call them a *Vicarious Puniſhment*, as they are *Vice Pœnæ*, in the *Room*, and *Stead* of a *proper Puniſhment*.

Gerardus

Gerardus Voſſius, in a Letter to *Grotius*, is very expreſs, that in this point *Epiſcopius* differed from him. For, 'Tho' He owned that Chriſt's Sufferings had a 'reſpect unto God and not only, unto men; yet the 'Grand Queſtion is, ſaith He, *what reſpect?* As for 'the Opinion commonly Embraced, *viz.* that Chriſt 'bore that *Puniſhment*, which was due to us, he could 'by no means admit, becauſe then He thought 'Chriſt muſt have been plung'd into deſpair, and 'ſuffer the very Torments of Hell; and that Par-'don of ſin would be made hereby Impoſſible ——— 'That his Notion of ſatisfaction was, that as, in the '*Old Teſtament*, ſins were Pardoned on *the Offering of a* '*Sacrifice without any ſuffering of a Puniſhment*; even ſo, 'in the *New Teſtament* on *the Intervention of Chriſt's* '*Sacrifice*, which abundantly excels them under the '*Old*, are all our ſins forgiven us: That herein, lay 'the Errour of *Socinius*, that He Denied Chriſt's 'Sacrifice to be properly *Propitiatory*. *Epiſt. Præſt. Viror. Ep.* 278. Thus far *Epiſcopius*, who, in his publick Writing uſed more Caution, yet to his Particular Friend He thus freely opens himſelf, and *Limborch* thought it meet to acquaint the World with it, *Curcellæus*, who ſucceeded him in the Profeſſors Chair, declares freely, 'That Chriſt did not '*Satisfie*, as is commonly apprehended, by ſuffering 'all thoſe Puniſhments, which we had deſerved by 'our Sins. Firſt, becauſe ſuffering Puniſhment be-'longs not to the Reaſon of a *Sacrifice*, and hath no-'thing Common with it. Sacrifices are not *Debito-'rum Solutiones*, the Payment of Debts, as appears 'from the Legal Inſtitutions. *Curcel. Relig. Chriſts Inſtit. lib.* 5. *c.* 19. § 14, 15.

Lemborch holds the ſame Opinion, 'It may be 'in a certain ſenſe ſaid, that *Chriſt was Puniſhed for* '*us*, as there was laid upon him a Vicarious Puniſh-ment, that is Affliction, *qua Pœnæ vicem ſuſtenuit*,

in the place and ſtead of puniſhment. *Limb. Theol. Chriſt. Lib.* 3. *c.* 22. § 2.

4. Having thus ſtated the Controverſie between the Orthodox and the *Socinians*, together with *Epiſcopius* and his Followers, I will conſider the Enquiry; What is the *Nice* Difference between Chriſts Anſwering the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works, and his Anſwering *for our Violation of the Law of Works?* And deſire my Brother to conſider, that a Man may ſubſcribe to this Aſſertion, *That Chriſt anſwered for our Violation of the Law of Works*, conſiſtently with his denying Chriſts Sufferings to be properly pænal: But ſeeing, the violated Law of Works *obliged* unto a *proper puniſhment*, Chriſt could not Anſwer for us the Obligations of this Violated Law any otherwiſe than by ſuffering a Proper Puniſhment for our ſins; So that, tho' an inſiſting on Chriſts Anſwering for our Violation of the Law of Works, ſecures not this Great Truth of Chriſts ſuffering a proper Puniſhment for our ſins; yet his Anſwering the *Obligations of the Violated Law*, doth it moſt effectually. But,

5. My Brother aſſuring us, that no Terms or Paſſages were waved and paſſed by but ſuch as could not bear a ſound Senſe, and this word [Obligations] which eſtabliſhes Chriſts ſuffering a *proper puniſhment* being waved, is it not a plain Indication, that my Brother hath at leaſt a concern for them, who with the *Socinians* and *Epiſcopians* deny the Sufferings of Chriſt to be a proper Puniſhment, or Satisfactory to Gods Juſtice for our ſins, or hath in ignorance ſpoken all this?

6. It's now time therfore, to gather up what my Brother hath ſaid to the ſhaking the Foundations of Chriſts Satisfaction; which is ſo very much, that an Engliſh *Unitarian*, in the way now eſteemed moſt likely to ſucceed, could do no more towards it.

If

If any one of them hath made it his Province to expose the Assertion of a *Necessity of a Commutation, or Change of Persons between Christ and us, hath rejected the Phrases, of Christs sustaining the Person of Sinners; of a Change of Persons between Christ and us; of laying the guilt of our Iniquities upon Christ; of his Answering the Obligations of the violated Law of Works; of his bearing our sins in his own body, as our Surety, and feeling the weight of Gods wrath in the punishment of our sins transferr'd upon him,* and expose them all as what *can't bear a sound Sense,* but are *lyable to be Interpreted to a Sense, and sound of Malignity to the whole of the Gospel; and Ridiculing some of them as Jargons of Art, of a very late Contrivance; fit to amaze, puzzle and confound mens Understandings,* affirming, that their sense and meaning must be *Blasphemy,* and that the Phrase of *Christs suffering in our stead,* cannot signifie more than *for our good*: Should, I say, an *English Socinian* start up and write after this rate, would you not be apt to say he hath done his part to break down the Barriers of our holy Religion in the Article of Christs Satisfaction, he hath made many bold stroaks, and done his most to subvert this Glorious Doctrine. Why, these things are done by my Reverend Brother; who, I hope, was not aware of what he was adoing, when he wrote his Rebuke, but I'll not aggravate, I will only endeavour to Inculcate.

1. That the Rejecting so many sound Terms and Phrases, established by a long Prescription in the Church of God, as most apt to explain the Truth and and distinguish it from Error, may be justly esteemed as a good Reason for such an one, as observed thus much in a calm way and manner to do his most for the securing the endangered Truths.

2. That the Rejecting them for the Reasons mentioned in the Rebuke may Justly Allarm the Orthodox amongst us, and Justifie their insisting on a fuller secu-

rity for Truth than the third Paper Affords. But I ſhall have a fair Occaſion to preſs this Conſideration ſome what further, in my Anſwer to the following Enquiry.

VI. *Why ſo many Orthodox Terms, and Phraſes, which were in the Firſt Paper, are left out of the third?*

Altho' I have already ſuggeſted what my Brother has ſaid of the Reaſon; yet, it being a Matter of great Importance, I will, in this place, be more full, in ſetting before you what he ſaith of the *Mature Deliberation*, and *Juſt Reaſons*, upon which they have Rejected thoſe Phraſes; and then ſhow who are herein imitated, and what are the moſt likely Conſequences of ſuch a Practice.

As to what my Brother ſaith of the Brethrens Rejecting theſe Phraſes, with deliberation and for juſt Reaſons, take his own Words.

Faithful Rebuke.

'5. Thoſe Brethren, who had their *Heads*, their *Hands*, 'and *Hearts* too, in *Drawing*, *Dreſſing*, and *ſigning* the 'former Paper, when they had heard the *Reaſon*, and '*Arguments* of the *whole Body*; where all Matters 'were managed, not in a *haſty* and *præcipitate* way, but 'with the *greateſt calmneſs*, *by ſlow paces*, with great 'liberty and freedom of debate, and being now diſ-in-'cumbred from the Counterpoize of Oppoſitions, or 'Inſinuations; might, and did ſee *Juſt* Reaſons to '*alter the Phraſes*, and new-model ſome Expreſſions.

'6. And hereof you may be fuller Aſſured, inaſ-'much, as thoſe *individual* Nine Brethren, who for, 'and in hopes of Peace, had ſigned *the* former *Paper*, 'had their *Hands*, and *Heads*, and *Hearts* too, in the '*Forming*, *Wording*, and Aſſenting to this *third*: Nor 'did they herein alter their Judgments, or vary in the 'leaſt from *their Zealous Deſires of Peace and Union*; 'only they now ſaw this *laſt* Paper was in all things

'the

'the ſame with the *former*, ſaving in ſome *few* Paſſages, 'and *Expreſſions*, which carryed a *Face* of ſome *dan-* 'gerous *Tendencies*; which, however they might eſcape 'the Notice of *Private* Brethren, could not eſcape 'the *Obſervation* of the many Diſcerning Heads, who 'with *utmoſt Application*, ſet themſelves to prevent 'any Inconvenience, that might ariſe to the Truths 'of the Goſpel.——— The Brethren did unani- 'mouſly agree to grant as much as the Sound Senſe 'could bear; and modeſtly to wave and paſs by the 'other, which was lyable to be Interpreted to a Senſe 'and Sound of Malignity to the whole of the *Goſpel*: pag. 29, 30.

Reply.

I. My Brother here gives a Character of ſuch as did Sign the *firſt Paper*; and of them, who Formed, Worded and Aſſented unto the *Third*: The former are Private Brethren, who, it's like, were ſo haſty in what they did, that ſome Paſſages of a dangerous Aſpect eſcaped their Notice: The *other* are the *whole* Body, many *Diſcerning Heads*, whoſe obſervation, the dangerous Paſſages could not Paſs; who gave ſuch *Reaſons* and *Arguments* to their *Private* Brethren, as convinced them, that there were *Juſt Reaſons* to Alter the Phraſes and new Model ſome Expreſſions. Now, that you may the more rightly Judge of this Matter, I will give you the *Names* of theſe *Private* Brethren; who were ſo *Haſty* and *Inconſiderate*, tho' when with the Body, ſo thoughtful as to receive much light from the ſtrong Reaſons of the *many Diſcerning Heads*: They were, Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Shower*, Mr. *Burgeſs*, Mr. *Slauter*, Mr. *Quick*, Mr. *Evans*, Mr. *Veal*, Mr. *Hill* of *Roterdam*, Mr. *Glaſcock*, and three or four more. The *Names* of the *many Diſcerning* Heads, I need not give, and therefore I will leave the Reader to Pauſe a while on the Repreſentation my Brother hath given of this Matter,

ter, and go on to consider what he further saith of them.

II. The Private *Brethren*, such as Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Howe*, &c. received so much light from the *many Discerning* Heads, that as they *might*, so they did see *Just Reasons* to alter the Phrases, and *New Model* some *Expressions*, ay, to *wave*, and *pass by* some Phrases, as what *could not bear a* sound sense, but were *liable* to be Interpreted to a sense and sound of Malignity to the Gospel.

In this place 'twill be Expedient that we *compare* the *Two Papers*, and see what are the *Waved*, and *Altered Passages*.

The *First* Paper.	The *Third* Paper.
1. *Bearing with One anothers Infirmities*, and *Different Sentiments* about Logical, *or* Philosophical Terms, or meerly Humane Forms of Speech, in matters of Lesser weight.	1. *Bearing with One anothers Infirmities, and* Different Sentiments *in matters of Lesser weight*, not contending about *Logical, or Philosophical* Terms, or *meer Humane Forms of Speech.*

The *Alteration* in this place, how *Insignificant* soever, it may seem to some, is in a point, that Affects the *very Vitals* of our Holy Religion; For, by this *Change*, the words [in *matters of lesser weight*,] being transferr'd [*from Logical Terms*] unto [*different sentiments*] a matter of another kind, with an addition of [*not Contending about Logical, or Philosophical Terms*, &c.] without the Restriction [*in matters of lesser weight*] a *Liberty* to contend about these *Terms* in *matters of greater weight*, is denied, and the *Assenters* unto the *Third* Paper are brought under an Obligation to sit still, as silent Spectators, whilst the *Episcopians*,

copians, and *Socinians* are Expoſing to the greateſt Reproach the *Logical*, and *Philoſophical Terms* and *Humane Forms of Speech*, pitch'd upon by the Church of God to *Explain* the Foundation Points both of *Revealed* and *Natural* Religion.

To clear thus much, I deſire to Inculcate theſe following Particulars. 1. That it's an Unexpreſſible Grievance unto all *ſorts* of *Heretick*s to obſerve in the Church of God a *ſtrict Adherence* to thoſe *Logical*, or *Philoſophical Terms* that have been choſen, and ſettled, as what do moſt aptly and clearly explain thoſe glorious *Truths*, diſcovered unto us by the *Light of* Nature, and *Scripture Revelation*; and clearly diſtinguiſh theſe moſt Important *Truths* from Errour.

2. That it hath been the way of *Heriticks* to *quarrel* with theſe *Terms*, becauſe not found in the *Letter of Scripture*. Tho' the Controverſie is about the *ſenſe* of Scripture, ay, about the ſenſe of every Text is there a Controverſie with one *Heretick* or other; yet, will they have us to confine our ſelves to Scripture *phraſes*, in Explaining Scripture *phraſes*.

Tho' it's undoubtedly True, that there is no better way to Underſtand the genuine ſenſe of Scripture, than by comparing Scripture with Scripture, yet it's no leſs True, that it's not ſo eaſie to convey the True ſenſe unto others without the help of *Humane Forms of Speech*.

Amongſt many others it's well obſerved by the learned Mr. *Norton* of *New-England*, that the moſt *Peſtilent Doctrines* have often times been communicated in the *Language of Scripture*; which was the reaſon, why St. *Hierome* ſpeaking againſt the Hereſies of *Ebion*, *Photinus*, *Marcion*, and *Baſilides*, did ſay, *Think not the* Goſpel *to be in the* words *of the Scripture, but in the ſenſe*. And Mr. *Norton* adds, who is *Ignorant*, that

that the *Arians* ſpeak Hereſie by that Text, *The Father is greater than I, Joh.* 14. 28.

But *Biddles Scripture Catechiſm* is an illuſtrious Evincement of this Truth, for there he hath in *Scripture words*, delivered very groſs Errours, for inſtance, that God hath a *ſimilitude*, or *ſhape* whoſe *Eſſence* is *confined to the Heavens*, and the like; as alſo, that *God is not Omniſcient*, for he knows not what will be hereafter; Whereas, *in Truth*, God is *Omniſcient*, and *Incomprehenſible* too. And though theſe *Terms* are not in the *Letter* of Scripture; yet the *things contained* in theſe *Terms* and *Phraſes*, are *Expreſly* in the *Scriptures*. And as the learned Biſhop of *Worceſter* affirms. 'It is the *Wiſer* and *Safer* Courſe to keep in 'the *ſame Way*, which the Chriſtian Church hath 'uſed, ever ſince ſhe hath agreed to expreſs her ſenſe 'in ſuch *Terms*, which were thought moſt proper for 'the purpoſe. ——— And ſince no other can be 'found more ſignificant and proper for that End, it '*looks like yielding too* Great Advantage *to our Adver-*'*ſaries*, to give up the Boundaries of *our Faith. Pref. to the Vindic. of the Trin. p.* 2, 3. But I do alſo Obſerve,

3. That the firſt *Attempts* made by them, who forſake the Faith, are on theſe *Terms* and *Phraſes*. Thus the *Socinians*, (as I have ſhewn in my *Growth of Error*) did about the year 1562. labour to engage the Miniſters in ſome parts of *Poland* to *Abſtain* from the uſe of *Philoſophical Terms*, *or Humane Forms of Speech*, and as *Stonius* Obſerves, it was this year concluded in a *Synod* at *Pinczow*, that the Miniſters ſhould not uſe any *Philoſophical Modes* of Speech, ſuch as the *Trinity*, *Eſſence* &c. but that every one ſhould confine himſelf to the *Terms* uſed in the Writings of the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, and in the *Apoſtles Creed*. p. 175.

Epiſcopius, and his Followers took the ſame Method, when they Attempted to ſubvert the commonly

monly received Doctrine about Chriſt's Satisfaction. In a Letter to *Schotlerus*, he confeſſes, 'twas charged upon him, that he uſed other *phraſes*, than thoſe received by the Church, and ſuch as ſeemed to Favour the *Socinian* Cauſe, and the Truth of the charge againſt him he does not deny. Curcellæus doth the ſame, and has a *Diſſertation* againſt *Marteſius*, wherein he defends the laying by of ſundry *phraſes*, uſed by the Church of God, becauſe not found in the *Letter* of *Scripture*, but both *Epiſcopius* and *Curcellæus*, did not content themſelves in the laying aſide the *Uſe* of theſe *phraſes*, but went on to oppoſe the Truths Explained by 'em, and at laſt lodged themſelves in the *Socinian* Tents, and are Juſtly, by *Sandius*, placed in the *Anti-Trinitarian Bibliothec.*

4. As it has been the *Practice* of *Hereticks* to make their *firſt* Attempts on Orthodox *phraſes*, that they may the more effectually Introduce their Errour; in like manner, it has been the *care* of them, who are *ſound* in *the Faith*, to keep up thoſe *Banks* or Barriers, and to Defend theſe *phraſes*, as the *Boundaries* of the Truth. When *Gregorius Pauli*, and many others of the *Socinian* Faction ſtruggled for the *Diſuſe* of all *phraſes*, not expreſly delivered in Scripture, and *Sarnicius* with Divers others ſo earneſtly contended for their Uſe, as they did moſt clearly expreſs the *Truth*, and diſtinguiſh it from Errour, that *Gregories* party found it moſt Prudent to admit of their Uſe. And the *Orthodox* in all Ages, would by no means part with theſe phraſes.

5. In *Imitation* of our Fore-fathers, and according to the *conſtant Practice* of the Church, before and ſince the Reformation, the *Reverend Brethren*, who ſent the *firſt* Paper unto the *Congregational*, Obſerving the Charge to be, that *the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction was corrupted*, did in the ſaid Paper, ſingle out, and pitch'd upon thoſe Terms, *Expreſſions* and *Phraſes*,

Phraſes, which have been Uſed by Proteſtants, to Explain this Doctrine. Such as a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*; *Chriſts taking on him our Perſon*; and *coming into our Room and Stead*, to *anſwer for us the* Obligations of the *Violated Law of Works*; the *laying the guilt of our Iniquities on Chriſt*; and that *Chriſt conſidered in relation to us*, as our Surety, did *feel*, and *bear the Diſpleaſure of God, and the Weight of his Wrath*. And hereby, as men found in the Faith, they fully removed what was matter of *Offence* to their *Grieved* Brethren. But

6. How *Innocent* ſoever theſe *phraſes* are, how *apt* to explain the *Truth*, and how *Neceſſary* ſoever to diſtinguiſh it from Errour, it cannot be admitted by others, for the *Awes*, and *ſecret Influences* of that very man, who has relinquiſhed the *commonly Received Doctrine of Proteſtants*, in this Inſtance, are ſo powerful, that theſe *phraſes* muſt be rejected; and what cannot but aſtoniſh our Brethren in the Country, the Orthodox in the *Church of England*, *Scotland* and the Reformed abroad, they are rejected, as *phraſes*, that *cannot* be ſafely *retain'd*; *that can't bear a ſound ſenſe*; but are liable to be Interpreted to a *ſenſe* of *Malignity* to the *whole* of the Goſpel, which is ſuch a bold ſtroke, ſo deep a wound given the Doctrine commonly paſſing in regard to *Chriſts Satisfaction*, as hath not been given it by any but by ſuch as *Epiſcopius*, *Socinus*, and their Admirers; and it's carried on with ſo High a Hand, that whoever dares Appear to Detect their Attempt, tho' with the greateſt ſoftneſs of Expreſſion, muſt be cried down as a *Fire-brand* and a *Diſturber* of our Peace, and the very Man, who once Pleaded for the Faith, is turn'd with much ſeverity againſt his Orthodox Brethren, and as if this had been the time to follow the Blow, and ſtrike at all, it is Inſerted as a *Term* of Peace, in the Paper, ſent from *Little St. Hellens*, that there muſt be,

7. No

7. No Contending about Logical, or Philoſophical Terms; or *meerly humane Forms of Speech*; *tho' about Matters of* the greateſt *Importance*, as appears by their removing from this Place the *limitation which in the firſt Paper*, was [*in matters of Leſſer Weight.*]

That I may, in this place, diſcharge my Conſcience with the greateſt Impartiality, I do declare, 1. That I Charge not the Brethren at *Little St. Hellens*, as a *Body*, for I am Perſwaded the greateſt Part of them are not aware of the *Deſign*, or *Tendency* of this *Alteration*; and that the *Chief Contriver* doth *gaudere ſinu*, to Obſerve, how he impoſes on them; and how he has Tooled my Rebuker, who, I would hope, has his Heart as yet untainted with the *Errours*, delivered in his *Rebuke*. However,

2. It is moſt evident to me, that as they will Anſwer it in the great Day of the Lord, they are under the ſtrongeſt Bonds of doing their utmoſt to put a Check to thoſe Invaſions made on the *Truth* by the Methods, uſed by the Contriver of the *third Paper*. I ſpeak of them, who are convinced of the *truth of the Commonly received Doctrine of Proteſtants, for by Countenancing this Paper*, they *in Fact Renounce what they Believe to be True*; and by approving of this *Alteration*, which will by no means allow of our *contending about Logical or Philoſophical Phraſes*, tho' in *Matters of greateſt Weight*, they open a gap for the letting in all manner of errour; For

8. They, by *Aſſenting to this Paper*, have put in a Bar againſt their contending for any Logical Phraſes, and when the *Socinians* ſhall expoſe to Contempt and Ridicule *ſome Phraſes*, which expreſs, what is Eſſential to the Principles of *Natural* as well as of *Revealed Religion*, they muſt break their Promiſe, or be ſilent; ſuffering the very *Deiſt* to carry all before him.

To clear thus much 'twill be ſufficient to mention what *Biddle* ſays on this *Topick*; I'le give you his own Words,

Words, 'Examine therefore the Expreſſions of God's 'being Infinite, and Incomprehenſible; of his being a ſimple 'Act; of his ſubſiſting in three Perſons; of a Divine Cir-'cumincession; of an eternal Generation; of an eternal 'Proceſſion of an Incarnation; of an Hypoſtatical Union, '——— of Original Sin; of Chriſts making ſatisfaction 'to God for our Sins, both paſt, preſent and to come; of 'Chriſts fulfilling the Law for us; of Chriſts being puniſhed 'of God for us; of Chriſts merits, his meritorious Obedience, 'both Active and Paſſive, ——— of Chriſts enduring 'the wrath of God for us, —— of Apprehending and Ap-'plying Chriſts Righteouſneſs to our ſelves by Faith; of 'Chriſts being a Surety; of Chriſts paying our Debts; 'of our Sins imputed unto Chriſt; of Chriſts dying to 'appeaſe the wrath of God—— of infuſed Grace, ——— 'of irreſiſtible workings of the Spirit in bringing men to 'believe ——— of ſpiritual Deſertions, &c. ——And 'thou ſhalt find that as theſe Forms of Speech are 'not owned by the Scripture, ſo neither the things 'contained in them. So far *Biddle* in his *Preface to his Catechiſm*.

That the things contained in theſe *Forms of Speech* are moſt plainly and expreſly revealed in Scripture, and that God is *Infinite* and *Incomprehenſible*, made known by the Light of Nature, is certain; But that the *Phraſes* themſelves are not *Literally* in the Scriptures muſt be acknowledged, and if we muſt not contend about the above-mentioned *Phraſes*, will not the Followers of *Biddle* and the *Engliſh Unitarians* Triumph over us? And ſhould this *Paper* paſs as the *Senſe of the Diſſenters*, would they not provoke unto it, to the great grief of many ſound and godly Divines in the *Church* of *England*, as well as of our Country Brethren?

But, I will ſay it again, for I believe it to be true, that there are not five of the Brethren who meet at *Little St. Hellens*, who are aware of this and that, on a review, they will never bring themſelves under

the

the *Obligation* of not contending for the above-mentioned *Phraſes*, tho' but humane Forms of Speech, ſuited to explain the neceſſary Articles of Religion; ſo far is my Brother from the Truth, when he ſaith, that the *third* Paper was with that deliberation, ſlow paces, &c. Compoſed.

The First Paper.	*The Third.*
2. *Altho' Regeneration, Repentance towards God, Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and holy Converſation, are by Gods expreſs word manifeſtly neceſſary to the Salvation of a Sinner, yet that none of theſe*, &c.	2. *That altho' the expreſs word of God do Aſſert the neceſſity of Regeneration to our entring into the Kingdom of God, and Requires Repentance, that our ſins may be blotted out, and Faith in Chriſt, that we may be juſtified, and holineſs of heart and life, without which we cannot ſee God; Yet that none of theſe*, &c.

It will be expedient, that I do in this place obſerve,

1. That according to what my Brother declares again and again, it muſt be ſuppoſed that this *Paſſage* in the firſt Paper can't be ſafely retained, that it can't bear a *Sound Senſe*, but is lyable to be interpreted to a *Senſe and Sound of Malignity* to the *whole* of the *Goſpel*, and therefore upon *mature deliberation* waved, and another *Paſſage* put into its place; whereas, in my Opinion, no one, that is not of the worſer ſort of *Antinomians*, even a *Libertine*, who denys *Regeneration, Repentance towards God, Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and Holy Converſation, to be neceſſary to the Salvation of Sinners*, dares ſay, *that this Paſſage can't bear a Sound Senſe*, &c. and *therefore muſt be Altered.*

That my Brother has out-run himſelf, and all his old avowed Principles, in this way of Writing, is enough to awaken us all to take heed, how we do in the leaſt Point, turn aſide from the Truth, nothing being more manifeſt than that *uno abſurdo dato mille ſequuntur.*

But tho' my Brothers *Writings* are in this Particular ſo extravagantly Erroneous, I would willingly hope, 1. Better things of him, and in Charity will place this *Miſtake* amongſt his *Incogitancies*, concluding that when he ſaid, what alterations were made, were upon *Juſt Reaſons*, and what was *waved* could not bear a Sound Senſe, he did not think on the *paſſing by this Paſſage*, it being very common for Men in a heat to forget themſelves.

2. My Brother doth perhaps look on this *Paſſage*, in the *firſt Paper*, not to contain in it, ſo full a Teſtimony againſt *Antinomianiſm*, as he could wiſh, and thinks needful, which I ſhould have more firmly believed, in caſe he had not delivered himſelf ſo poſitively as above: However, I think it not amiſs to ſhow what fell under Conſideration, when this *Point* was to be *ſtated.*

1. It was thought moſt conducive to the great end, to avoid as much as poſſible, a running into the Diſcuſſion, and Determination of Differences of *leſſer moment*, which were agitated amongſt the godly Orthodox themſelves, and therefore to keep to thoſe Matters which did more nearly concern the *Eſſential Articles of Faith.*

2. There being a Controverſie amongſt the Reformed themſelves about the order, between Faith and Repentance, as which hath the *Antecedence* and *Priority*; and whether Repentance was a neceſſary *prærequiſite* to pardon, the *Compoſers* of the *Firſt* Paper waved the determination thereof; which was no more than was done in the Compoſing the Seven *Propoſitions* which

which were renounced to the end we might expreſs our abhorrence of *Antinomian* Errours; a brief account of which will be needful, not only to detect my Brothers miſtakes touching matter of Fact in this one point, but to Inlighten others in this Affair.

It muſt then be carefully minded, 1. That the Renunciation of *Antinomianiſm*, of which my Brother ſpeaks, *pag.* 23. was drawn up by ſome Brethren of *both Perſuaſions*; of which number the very *Perſon*, my Brother takes to be the *Reporter*, was One, who faithfully tranſcribed the ſeven Propoſitions agreed unto, and by Direction carried 'em unto the Brethren at *Little St. Hellens*, where he Read them, and expreſſed his great ſatisfaction of the Renunciation, as ſeveral of them, who do now ordinarily meet there can Teſtifie.

2. That whereas Mr. *Williams* inſiſted on the Aſſertion of the neceſſity of Repentance in order to Pardon, about which the Orthodox have different Sentiments, 'twas at laſt agreed to aſſert the *neceſſity of Repentance*, and leave this Controverſie undetermined, which was done by declaring againſt what was *Oppoſite* in this matter unto the Aſſembly, as you have it in the fourth *Propoſition*, where we renounce the Doctrine of them who hold [*That any may expect Pardon without Repentance.*] To return,

3. The only difference that I can ſee between the *Firſt* and *Third* Paper, in this particular, muſt be in theſe words, [*That God requires Repentance that our ſins* may be blotted out] which look as if the determining this Controverſie had been deſigned: The reaſon why I can ſee no other difference is, becauſe I know that the Congregational do hold, That *the Expreſs Word of God* doth Aſſert *the neceſſity of Regeneration to our entring into the Kingdom of God; and Faith in Chriſt that we may be juſtified, and Holineſs of Heart and Life, without which we cannot ſee God*, for theſe

things are all included in what is in the *first* Paper. And in case my Brethren, who glory in their confining themselves unto *Scripture Expressions*, will take in the whole verse, they refer unto, when they say [*That God requires Repentance that our sins may be blotted out,*] which is [*When the times of Refreshing shall come from the Presence of the Lord*] I know not a Man among the Congregational, that will scruple to Express his Assent unto this Clear and Full Testimony against *Antinomians* in the Fundamental Article of *Justification*: And, if any of them do agree with *Polanus*, and many more sound Protestants in this *Undecided* Controversie, it cannot advantage the *Antinomians*, especially seeing they hold, *That none may expect Pardon without Repentance.*

First Paper.	The *Third.*
3. *Yet that none of these, or any work done by men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, is* under the Notion of Subordination, *or under any Denomination* whatsoever any *Part of that Righteousness*, &c.	3. *Yet that none of these, or any work done by men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, is, under any* Denomination whatsoever any Part of that Righteousness, *&c.*

1. In this place the words [Under the Notion of Subordination] is waved, and as my Brother will have us believe, upon the *weightiest Reasons*, as what can't *bear a sound sense.* And yet,

2. The following words which are left in [*under any Denomination whatsoever*] should methinks be comprehensive enough to take in under 'em [*the Notion of Subordination*] for a Subordinate Righteousness falls within the circle [*of any Denomination whatsoever.*] But,

3. My

3. My Brother can't endure to ſwallow a Contradiction, which this muſt be, in caſe the phraſe [*under the Notion of Subordination*] cannot bear a ſound meaning, as it cannot in the Opinion of my Brother, becauſe it's waved; and yet is comprized under [any Denomination whatſoever] which muſt bear a ſound ſenſe becauſe not paſſed by, for which reaſon we muſt endeavour to ſave it from a Contradiction, which cannot be but by reſtraining this Univerſal Term [*Under any Denomination whatſoever*] thus, [*under any Denomination whatſoever that can bear a ſound ſenſe,*] but [*the Notion of Subordination*] not being able to bear a ſound ſenſe it's not to be taken within the verge of *under any Denomination whatſoever.*] Well then,

4. If this phraſe [*under the Notion of Subordination*] can't bear a ſound ſenſe, it muſt be becauſe they hold a Subordinate Righteouſneſs in our Juſtification, where it muſt be noted, that here is the mention only of one Juſtification, which carrieth in it the *Pardon of ſin*, the *accepting of ſinners*, and an *Entituling them to Eternal Life*; and that this Juſtification is not *only* by *Chriſts Righteouſneſs*, *but alſo* by a *Subordinate one*, of our own, they both concurring to our Juſtification, the one *Principally*, the other *Subordinately*. This is the only way, that I can think on to fetch my Brother off from a Contradiction, and yet do I what I can I muſt at laſt lodge him under a Contradiction. For,

5. This *Third* Paper doth expreſly declare, that we are *Pardoned*, *Accepted*, and *Entituled to Eternal Life* only *by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed unto us, and received by Faith alone.* But to be Pardoned, Accepted, and Entituled unto Eternal Life only by Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and yet to be Pardoned, Accepted or Entituled to Eternal Life by a *Subordinate Righteouſneſs of our own* is an Implication. Being thus

neceſſitated to leave my Brother in theſe dark ſhades, I will return to the *private Brethren*, ſuch as Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Aſſop*, and the reſt of this denomination, to ſee what Influence that light, which they received from the many diſcerning Heads hath had on them, which my Brother aſſures me was very great. For, he ſaith,

III. 'Thoſe Individual nine Brethren, who for, 'and in hopes of Peace had *ſigned* the *former Paper*, 'had their *Hands*, their *Heads*, and their *Hearts* too, 'in the *forming*, *wording*, and *aſſenting* to this *Third* —. 'For they now ſaw in the *former* ſome few *Paſſages* 'and *Expreſſions*, which carried a *Face* of ſome *dan-* 'gerous *Tendencies*; which, however they might eſcape 'the *Notice* of Private Brethren, could not paſs the 'obſervation of many diſcerning Heads.

In Examining this Paſſage, it muſt be remark'd.

1. That theſe Private Brethren, every one of the *Individual Nine*, ſaw the Face of ſome *dangerous Tendencies*, in the *Firſt* Paper, which they had formerly Subſcribed, and therefore muſt be now ſuppoſed to Repent of *that*; but whether this be true or not, I appeal to their own *Conſciences*, for, till this Brother publiſhed his *Rebuke*, I could not hear one word to this purpoſe, ſome of 'em aſſuring me, that the *Alterations* between the two Papers were but *very Minute*, ſuch *Tantilla* as were not worth a contending about, and not of ſuch things as were of *dangerous Tendencies*.

2. Several of the *Nine* have very lately declared their Approbation of the *Firſt* paper, and one of 'em in particular told me, that my Brother was guilty of a *Notorious Falſhood* in ſaying, that the *Individual Nine* had their *Hands*, their *Heads*, and *Hearts* in the forming, wording and aſſenting to the Third Paper, for he had neither Hand, nor Head, nor Heart in it.

3. If

3. If the Individual *Nine* had a *Hand*, a *Head* and a *Heart* in compoſing the third, and in *Waving* the *Phraſes*, rejected, becauſe they could not bear a *ſound ſenſe*, then muſt Dr. *Bates*, who is one of the *Nine Private* Brethren, be for a waving the *Phraſes*, of *Chriſts ſuſtaining the Perſon of ſinners*; and *ſuffering the wrath of God as our Surety*, as what could not bear a *ſound ſenſe*, and if it be ſo, I do humbly *conclude* that 'tis his *Duty* to anſwer that part of his *Harmony*, where theſe *Phraſes* are uſed. and the Doctrine they expreſs is Aſſerted and Defended.

But ſure I am, that I have heard him ſay, that the *Harmony* was the fruit of *Fervent Prayer* of his cloſeſt ſtudies, and moſt Impartial Examination, not only of the *Orthodox*, but of their *Adverſaries*, and that, tho' twas his reſolution to follow light, and if he could meet with good reaſons to convince him, he was in an Errour, he would fall under it, yet hitherto he has met with no reaſons to move him to change his mind, and to this purpoſe he has ſpoke ſince the *compoſure* of the Third Paper.

To cloſe my Anſwer to this Enquiry, it's manifeſt to me that my Brother and his *Teacher* are for *rejecting* the above mentioned Orthodox *Terms* and *Phraſes*, becauſe they have forſaken the *Proteſtant Doctrine, as ordinarily conceived by them*. Tho' I have put my Charity on the outmoſt ſtretch in favour of my *Rebuking* Brother, yet muſt I ſay, That, if he doth not ſee the *Tendencies* of a rejecting the aforeſaid *Phraſes*, upon the *Reaſons* he has aſſigned, to be deſtructive of the Proteſtant Faith in the Article of *Chriſts Satisfaction*, He is not the fitteſt Man in the World to enter on a Controverſie of this kind; and yet I muſt at the ſame time acknowledge, that the more unmeet any one is to enter on this Controverſie, the more likely he is to be impoſed on by his more *ſeeing* guide,

who doth, in the inſtance before us, as the nature of the thing ſpeaks, leave the Reformed; and nothing ſhort of this can be the *import* of my Brothers arguings in his *Rebuke*.

This Aſſertion I do confeſs leads me to the conſideration of the *ſeventh Enquiry*, which is,

VII. In *what Confeſſions* are the *Terms* or *Phraſes*, ſo much contended for to be found?

My Brother is very confident, that the *Phraſe* of a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*, and his *taking on him the Perſon of Sinners* is not in any one *Confeſſion of Faith*. For, ſaith he,

Faithful Rebuke.

'Obſerve further, That the Phraſe of a *Change of* 'Perſons between Chriſt and Us, and his *taking upon him* 'the Perſon of Sinners, are Terms wholly Unknown 'to thoſe *Confeſſions* and *Articles*, which were made 'the Teſt of *ſoundneſs in the Faith*, by the United 'Miniſters, nay, if you have the leiſure, ſearch the 'whole Body of *Confeſſions* of the Reformed Churches 'from *Helvetia* to *Tranſilvania*, thence to *America*, 'and you ſhall not find theſe *Terms*, *Phraſes*, or Ex-'preſſions in any one of them. p. 17.

Reply.

1. This *ſtrong Aſſurance* of my Brother brings to my remembrance a paſſage I have met with in Mr. *Baxters Catholick Theology* of a *Jocular Contemptuous Defendant*; who, whilſt He pretended to have a *Commiſſion* from all the *Syſtematical Divines* of *Germany*, was ſo *Charitably Uncharitable* as to ſay, That *never a man* in his Wits *affirmed*, *That the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt was the* Formal *Cauſe of* our Juſtification. (*Append. to the Præmun. par.* 2.) whereas, on the other hand, *Davenant*, who was far from being a *Madman*, or from repreſenting the Proteſtants to be ſo,

doth

doth assure us, 'That it is the common sense of all 'our Divines, that the *Righteousness of Christ, imputed 'to us, is the* Formal *Cause of our Justification*, and as 'to what pertains to the *thing it self*, not one Prote-'stant Divine has either spoke, or *written otherwise.* Prælect. de Justit. hab. c. 22.

This Over-bold, Rash, and Untrue Assertion of the *Jocular Defendant*, ran in my Mind as soon as I entred on the Examination of what the *Rebuker* here says, not only because He has as little reason for what he says, but upon another account. For,

2. Do we in good earnest press for what hath not the countenance so much as of One *Confession of Faith?* This would really be hard, and Provocation sufficient to stir up his Anger against the offended Brethren. To whom, in Answer I do declare, that if I had not found these phrases in some *Publick Confessions*; nay, if I had not met with them in the *Holy Scriptures*, I would have been silent and never have put Pen to Paper, on this occasion. Mistake me not, my meaning is, that the *things signified* by these *Terms* and *Phrases*, are expressly in our Confessions, and in the *Holy Scriptures too*; and perhaps it may appear that the phrase most exposed by him, will be found to be literally in *one* or *other Confession.*

3. That I may set what I now *declare* in the clearest light, I must observe unto you,

1. That the phrases, of a *Commutation, or Change of Persons between Christ and us*; *of Christs sustaining our Person*; of his *being Substituted into our room*; and his *Suffering in our Place and Stead*, are so nearly Allied to each other, that they are as *Hypocrates* his *Twins*; they Live and Dye together. Grant one and all necessarily come in with it; oppose but any one of 'em in the genuine meaning, and you oppose all of 'em.

The *Phrase* of *Christs Dying in our Place and Stead*, as it imports somewhat more than for *our good*, implies

plies *a Subſtitution of Chriſt into our Place*, which *cannot be without a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*; or without *Chriſts ſuſtaining* our *Perſon*. If then any one of theſe phraſes be found in any one Confeſſion, there is an owning all the reſt.

2. Thoſe Scriptures, which ſpeak of Chriſts *Dying for us*; of his being a *Sacrifice*; and of his being our *Surety to ſatisfie the Law for us*, do all import Chriſts *Suffering in our ſtead*, his *being Subſtituted in our Place*, *a change of Perſons between him and us*, *and his ſuſtaining our Perſon* in ſuffering.

What I here aſſert is ſo clear, that there is no doubt of it amongſt the Orthodox, who throughly underſtand this Controverſie. Yea further,

3. Theſe controverted phraſes do expreſs what is eſſential unto a *Real*, *Proper* and *Plenary ſatisfaction* to Gods Juſtice for our ſins, and upon this account, in what confeſſion ſoever ſuch a ſatisfaction is aſſerted, there theſe phraſes are owned.

If then I can direct to the *Confeſſion*, where either a *Proper Satisfaction* is aſſerted; or, where 'tis declared, that *Chriſt as our* Surety *ſuffered for us*; or, that *Chriſt ſuffered in* our Place and Stead; or *ſtood in our Perſon*, when He Died, I hope it may ſatisfie any unprejudiced perſon, that the phraſes Contended for are in our Confeſſions; and if I ſhew that all theſe laſt mentioned are in ſome publick Confeſſions or Catechiſms, why may it not be enough to remove my Brother from his Faſtneſſes; and oblige him to conclude, that they who plead for their uſe are not ſo ſingular as he has Inſinuated?

Theſe things Præmiſed, our firſt Enquiry muſt be,

1. In what *Confeſſion* is a *proper Satisfaction* owned? Go to the *Aſſemblies*, *cap.* 8. *ſect.* 8. and there you may read, 'That the Lord Jeſus by his *Perfect Obe-* 'dience and *Sacrifice* of himſelf, hath fully ſatisfied 'the *Juſtice* of his Father. And *cap.* 11. *ſect.* 3. 'Chriſt

'Chriſt by his *Death* and *Obedience* did make a Pro-
'per, Real, and Full Satisfaction to his Fathers Ju-
'ſtice on their behalf. The ſame is repeated in the *larger Catechiſm* in anſwer to the Queſtion, *What is Juſtification?* and to that which follows it.

If my Brother can't ſee in the aſſertion of [a *Proper, Real and Full Satisfaction* made for us by Chriſt to the *Juſtice of God.*] the *Phraſe* [of a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us,*] it is not becauſe it's not there. For in a *Proper Satisfaction,* whatever is eſſential thereunto, as a *Commutation, or Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us is,* is contained; and whoever underſtands the true nature of a proper Satisfaction, cannot but ſee it. However for the ſake of the leſs ſtudied, I will by a very plain inſtance Illuſtrate thus much; affirming, that all ſound Believers are *Diſcharged from that Obligation to Puniſhment* they lay under for their paſt ſins, that the *Obligation unto Puniſhment,* is in their caſe, diſſolv'd, that this is the Doctrine embraced by the Reformed. Now, if my Brother demands of me, in what Confeſſion of Faith is this phraſe [of *Diſſolving the Obligation to Puniſhment*] to be found; In anſwer, I'll refer him to the Aſſemblies Confeſſion. cap. 11. ſect. 1. 'Thoſe 'whom God Effectually calleth, he alſo Freely Juſti-'fieth —— by *Pardoning their Sins.* If he ſaith, he can't in this place ſee the phraſe [of *Diſſolving the Obligation to Puniſhment.*] I'll tell him, it is there, tho' he can't ſee it, for in the *Pardon of ſin* it is, it being *Eſſential* unto *Pardon,* that the *Obligation unto Puniſhment be diſſolv'd,* to talk of the Pardon of a ſinner whilſt he continues to lye under the Obligation unto Puniſhment, is to Triſle, and to ſay, that the diſſolving the Obligation to Puniſhment cannot be read, where the Pardon of ſin is expreſſed, is to talk after ſuch a manner as Modeſty won't give me leave to call by its moſt proper name.

The

The ſame is true of Chriſts *Satisfaction*, and a *Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*; for, a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, is as eſſential unto a proper Satisfaction, as the diſſolving the Obligation to Puniſhment is unto Pardon of ſin.

2. The *phraſe* [of Chriſts *ſuffering* in our place and ſtead,] as it imports ſomewhat more than for our good, implies a *Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Us*; and ſignifieth the ſame with Chriſts *ſuffering in our Perſon, as our Surety*.

That it is thus underſtood by the *Orthodox*, I have already cleared, and to what hath been ſaid, I will add the Judgment of the *Palatinate Divines*, which they delivered into the *Synod of Dort*, which was, That one Errour, amongſt the many embraced by the *Remonſtrants*, was [the ſame which my *Brother* has in his *Rebuke*, viz.] That *to Die for ſinners muſt not be underſtood, as if Chriſt died* Loco, aut vice ipſorum, in their Place and Stead, *ſed* bono tantum, but only for their good.

This *Errour* theſe Divines, (in what they have ſaid on the *ſecond* of the *five Articles*) did confute, aſſerting, in oppoſition unto them, that Chriſt our Surety according to the Scriptures died *Loco Peccatorum*, in the place of ſinners, which in their *Orthodox Antitheſis* they thus explain, *partim* Loco, *partim* bono *ipſorum*. And it was Decreed by this *Synod*, 'That 'whereas we were unable of our ſelves to ſatisfie 'Gods Juſtice, and deliver our ſelves from his 'Wrath, God of his *Immenſe* Mercy, gave his *only* 'begotten Son to be a Surety for us; who, that he 'might make Satisfaction for us, was *made Sin*, and a 'Curſe on the Croſs *for us*, or *vice noſtra*, or in our 'ſtead.'

This Decree was about the year 1623. received by the Reformed in *France* in the Synod of Charenton,

tion, and ſubſcribed by the Paſtors and Elders of the ſaid Synod, with a Proteſtation in the Preſence of God, that through his grace, they would never depart from it; decreeing that it ſhould be inviolably obſerved by all the Churches, and Univerſities in that Kingdom.

And, in the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion*, Cap. 11. Sect. 3. it is expreſs, *That Chriſts Obedience and Satisfaction was accepted in* their ſtead; and why *accepted in* their ſtead? but becauſe Chriſt obeyed and ſatisfied in their ſtead: which, as I have ſhown, is as much as to ſay, Chriſt *obeyed and ſatisfied in our Perſon.* But of this more immediately under the next Head.

3. The *Term* [Surety] when applyed to Chriſt, as ſuffering for *our ſins*, denotes to us a *Change of Perſons between him and us*, and his ſuſtaining our *Perſon*, *in his ſufferings.*

Thus much is ſo evident, that they who have any tollerable Acquaintance with this Controverſie, and oppoſe the Phraſes of a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, and of Chriſts ſuſtaining our Perſon*, do alſo deny that *Chriſt ſuffered as our Surety.* Mr. *Ws.* himſelf therefore Rejects Chriſts being under the Law of Works, as our *Surety*, upon the old *Socinian* Bottom, as ſaid to be inconſiſtent with the Free Pardon of Sin. *Man made Right.* p. 92, 96. And my Brothers *many diſcerning Heads* do not only Reject Chriſts *taking on him the Perſon of Sinners*, as a Phraſe that can't bear a *Sound Senſe*, but they alſo Reject this other Phraſe [*of Chriſts being conſidered in Relation to us*, as our Surety, bearing our ſins in his own Body] and leaſt thus much ſhould have been inferr'd from that other *Phraſe* of [*Chriſts feeling and bearing* the Weight of Gods Wrath] it is alſo Rejected as what is lyable to a Senſe and Sound of Malignity to the whole of the Goſpel.

Now,

Now, if I muſt believe, as my Brother ſuggeſts, that theſe alterations and the Rejecting of theſe Phraſes is upon the aſſigned Reaſons is the deliberate Act of the whole Body, compoſed of *many diſcerning Heads*, that ſtill profeſs a Zeal for all the Doctrines contained in the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion*; *Larger and ſhorter Catechiſm*. I muſt declare, God knows, with a ſincere deſire, it may be with brokenneſs of Heart, and the deepeſt Humiliation, that our Caſe, in this regard, is more deplorable than I am willing to ſuggeſt, tho' I can't but reflect on the Calamitous Condition, into which our Brethren in *France* have fallen, ſince they omitted to witneſs ſo fully as they ſhould have done againſt *Armyraldian* Incroachments made on the Common Faith of *Proteſtants*, eſpecially ſeeing they are now out done, by *ſome amongſt our ſelves*.

If Chriſt was not as our *Surety*, made under the Law; If he did not endure the moſt *grievous Torments, immediately in his Soul*, and moſt *painful Sufferings in his Body*, *as* feeling and bearing the weight of Gods Wrath *due to us for our ſins*, how ſhall we be able to ſtand before the Bar of God in the great day? *Will the Lord be pleaſed with thouſands of Rams, or with ten thouſands of Rivers of Oyl? Shall I give my Firſt-born for my Tranſgreſſion, the Fruit of my Body for the Sin of my Soul?* Theſe things can't ſatisfie Gods Juſtice, nor appeaſe his Wrath, nor make an *Attonement* for our Sin. It muſt be Chriſts Suffering in our *ſtead, his bearing our ſins in his Body, as our Surety, and feeling, and bearing the Weight of Gods Wrath for our Sins*, that alone can ſave us.

But theſe *Phraſes*, tho' they were in the *Firſt Paper*, are *waved*, and left out of the *Third*, becauſe, as my Brother ſays, they can't *bear a ſound Senſe*, &c. whilſt a Zeal is pretended for the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion and Catechiſm*, in which the rejected Doctrines are *literally* aſſerted. In the *Confeſſion*, *Cap.* 8. *Sect.* 3, 'tis expreſs,

'That

'That the Father called the *Lord Chriſt* to the Office 'of a *Mediator*, and Surety: And in *Sect.* 4. this 'Office the Lord Chriſt did moſt willingly undertake, 'which that he might *diſcharge*, he was *made under the* 'Law, and did perfectly fulfil it, endured moſt grievous 'Torments *in his Soul*, and moſt painful Sufferings *in* 'his Body.

Theſe things the Lord Chriſt endured as our Surety; which is more fully delivered in Anſwer to that Queſtion, *How is Juſtification an Act of Gods Free Grace?* In which you will ſee Mr. *W's.* his Objection againſt Chriſts *being under the Bonds of the Law*, as our Surety, taken from a ſuppoſed inconſiſtency between it and the forgiveneſs of our Sins fully removed, in that it's there declared, 'Altho' Chriſt, by 'his *Obedience* and *Death*, did make a *Proper*, *Real* 'and *Full Satisfaction* to Gods Juſtice; yet in as much 'as God accepteth *the Satisfaction* from a Surety, 'which he might have demanded of *them*, did provide 'this Surety, his own only Son, imputing his Righte-'ouſneſs to them, and requiring nothing of them for '*their Juſtification* but *Faith*, which alſo is his gift, 'their *Juſtification is to them*, of Free-Grace.

But if Chriſt, as our Surety, doth ſo, will it not follow, that he paid our Debts? Yes, it will; And ſo, ſaith the *Aſſembly*, *Confeſ. Cap.* 11. § 3. '*Chriſt*, by 'his *Obedience* and *Death*, did fully diſcharge the 'Debt of all thoſe that are thus Juſtified, and did 'make a *proper*, *real*, and *full Satisfaction*. Did he not then *feel and bear the Weight of Gods Wrath*? Ay, he did ſo: And thus much is affirmed by the *Aſſembly* in the ſame Words, it is rejected by the *many diſcerning Heads*; For, in Anſwer to this Queſtion, *How did Chriſt humble himſelf in his Death?* It is in the *Larger Catechiſm*, thus, 'Chriſt humbled himſelf in that, 'having been betrayed by *Judas*————and having 'alſo *conflicted with the Terrors of Death*, and the

'*powers*

'*powers of Darkneſs*, felt and bore the weight of Gods 'Wrath; he *laid down his Life an Offering for ſin.*

Whether a Rejecting the Phraſes of Chriſts bearing our Sins in his Body, *as* our Surety, and his feeling and bearing the weight of Gods Wrath, be not a *Contravening* a *Doctrinal Article*, eſtabliſhed by the *Aſſembly*, at *Weſtminſter?* and whether this Brother who doth ſo, ought not to be Cenſured by the Body of the *United Miniſters*, if we may be ever ſo bleſſed, as to ſee ſuch a Meeting *once more.* I ſubmit to more diſcerning Heads; and ſure I am, that, however this Matter may iſſue, it's plain enough to me, that the Controverted *Phraſes* are owned by the Synod of *Dort*, eſtabliſhed in the Reformed Churches in *France*, as well as by the *Aſſembly* of Learned, Judicious, Godly and Orthodox Divines at *Weſtminſter.*

Well, but tho' I had leiſure to look into all the Confeſſions at home; or ſearch the whole Body of Confeſſions of the Reformed Churches from *Helvetia* to *Tranſylvania*, thence to *America*, can I find, in any one of them, the leaſt Countenance given to theſe Terms, Phraſes, or Expreſſions? Or is it poſſible to Obſerve in any one of them, ſo much as a ſmile on that Phrafe of Chriſts ſuffering in our *Perſon?* I anſwer,

1. What, tho' I can't? Is it not enough that I have ſhown, that the Controverted *Phraſes* are included in the Acknowledgment of Chriſts making a proper Satisfaction to Gods Juſtice for us? And that they are all virtually owned, which in ſundry Confeſſions and Synods, which have openly Received the Phraſe of Chriſts ſuffering in our Stead, as it ſignifyeth more than for our good, and is of the ſame Import with *Chriſts ſuffering in our Perſon*, but the owning that Chriſt as our Surety, felt and bore the *weight of Gods Wrath*, ſhould, methinks, be ſufficient. However,

2. That my Brother may ſee, that without going ſo

ſo far as *Helvetia*, *Tranſylvania* or *America*, we may find enough nearer home to convince him, that he has very little, or no Reaſon for his aſſuming way of Writing, I will only take a turn into *Scotland*, where we ſhall find this very *Phraſe* of *Chriſts dying in our Perſon*, inſerted in their *Confeſſion of Faith*, 'It became 'the *Meſſiah*, and *Redeemer* to be *True God*, and True 'Man, becauſe he was to ſuffer the *Puniſhments* due 'for our ſins, and to appear, [*quaſi in* Perſonâ noſtrâ, *coram Judicio Patris pro noſtrâ tranſgreſſione, & in obedientiâ pati, morte, mortis authorem ſuperare*] in our Perſon, before the Judgment Seat of the Father to ſuffer for our Tranſgreſſions, and by death to deſtroy him that had power over Death. Vid. *Carp. Confeſ. Ed. an.* 1612. *pag.* 142.

Here you ſee that the Church of *Scotland* above a hundred years ago, uſed this very *Phraſe*, which, my Brother aſſured us, could not be found in any one Confeſſion: and which, he ſays, doth make a *Blaſphemous Repreſentation* of Gods Love in the Redemption of falen Man, but I hope, when he ſhall be ſo far recovered as to be able to entertain ſome *free Thoughts*, on this Subject, he will do his part, to repair the *Breaches* he has, by his *Rebuke*, made on one of the Chief Articles of our Holy Religion, and do what in him lyeth, to clear the Orthodox from thoſe unjuſt Reproaches he has covered them with, by making them to hold and defend Blaſphemous Opinions in their uſe and defence of the Controverted *Phraſes*; And that it may be thus, it ſhall be my Prayer, and I deſire it may be alſo the Prayer of all them who love the Lord Jeſus in ſincerity.

There is one thing more needful to be ſpoken unto, before I cloſe my *Reply*: It is the Third and Laſt *general Head*, I have propoſed to be conſidered.

III. The Charge of Antinomianism.

1. MY *Brother*, that he may put the fairer Gloss, upon the New Notions, he has undertaken the Defence of, applyeth himself to the same *Artifices*, by which the *Socinians*, of old, used to Propagate their Heresies, which was to expose the *Reformed*, as Men of *Antinomian Principles*, Men of a very bad *Character*, and ill *Designs*.

2. That he has, without any provocation given him, thus *Aspersed* his *Congregational Brethren*, in the Bulk, without a *Salvo* to the Reputation of any one of them, I will particularly evince.

1. The *Charge of Antinomianism*; He lays in thus, 'The *True Reason of their* (the *Congregational Brethrens*) 'severe displeasure conceived against the *Third Paper* is, 'that it has so clearly and fully born its *Testimony* against 'the *Antinomians in the Fundamental Article of Justification*. Reb. p. 56. A little before this, 'I wish (saith he) you could inform me, Whether they, [*viz.* the '*Congregational*] have received any *New Revelations*, or 'made any *New Discoveries* of these great Secrets, and '*Indispensible Necessity* of these New Notions? [that is, if the *Terms*, *Phrases*, and *Doctrines*, long ago openly embraced by the Reformed] 'Whether they [the '*Congregational* still] are become τελεσται, the *Adepts*, in 'the Rosacrucian Mysteries, or have found out the 'Philosophers Stone to turn all *Antinomianism* into 'pure Gold. *pag.* 50.

I will here, only tell you, that these *Rosacrucians* are a People, who hold, that by the help of a Spirit which *Penetrates* the Universe, they are adorn'd with such *Angelical* Wisdom, as excels the Knowledge, convey'd to us by the Holy Scriptures, by which they may understand whatever is done, or can be known in the World——— They are a sort of *Chimists*, who, in their *Laboratories*, desired Instruction, either from the Stars, or after the manner of *Enthusiasts*, expect *secret*

Inspi-

Inſpirations and *Revelations*; as alſo *Converſes* and *Conferences* with Spirits, and great Aſſiſtances from them; whereupon many have been ſtrangely deluded by the Devil, who transforms himſelf into an Angel of *Light*. Theſe are the *Roſacrucians*, my Brother ſpeaks of, and as one in doubt, wiſhes to be informed, whether the *Congregational*, are not *Adepts*, great Proficients in their *Helliſh Myſteries*.

2. The Character he further gives of them is, 'That 'they are *Pettyfoggers*, whoſe work it is to ſow the 'Seeds of Strife, *pag.* 31. whoſe *deſultory Humours* '(or giddy Brains) can no more be fixed than *Proteus* 'can be bound. *pag.* 33. who are no longer of an Opi'nion than till the next Crotchet comes into their 'Heads to invent another. *pag.* 33. Great Intreaguers, 'p. 29. *Unreaſonable Men*, *Malitious Slanderers*, Guilty 'of a more heinous Sin, in that they Uſurp the Pri'viledge of God to Judge the *Heart*. p. 34. whoſe 'Grief, to obſerve how much the Doctrine of *Chriſts* 'Satisfaction is in danger, may remember you of what 'you Read in ſome *Naturaliſts*, That the Crocodile 'weeps over his Prey, and then devours it; whoſe 'Tears are all Mockery. p. 54. who Tye Mr. *Ws.* to 'the Stake to be Baited, (by their *Party*, that is, (by 'the Engliſh *Moloſſi*, or Maſtiff-Dogs, and every *Ir'ſhaſſing Welp*, that could bark, tho' not bite, Unreaſona'bly Cruel, putting ſuch Terms upon Mr. *Williams*, 'as are not ſo *Merciful*, as thoſe put upon the Men 'of *Jabeſh Gilead* by *Nahaſh*, 1 Sam. 11. 2. who would 'only thruſt out their *Right Eyes*, but theſe [*viz.* The '*Congregational*] would cut off his Right Hand too. 'p. 58. whoſe *Terms* ſavour too much of *Empire* over '*Souls*, and Dominion over the *Conſciences* and *Faith* 'of *Men*. p. 59 Who, when they promiſe not to 'make further Publick Conteſts, yet will then be 'for Private Whiſperings, Evil Surmiſes, Inſinua'ted Slanders, and Clandeſtine Reproaches, whilſt

'Mr. *W.* is alive, and 'tis to be feared will feed upon 'his Carcass, and Survive his Dust and Ashes. That 'these Bigots will never forgive them, who have join'd 'with the Brethren of a more *Benign Temper* in the '*Third Paper*. p. 60.

This is the way he takes to Treat a whole Party of Brethren in this City, who are known to be Men of *Integrity, soundness in the Faith*, and *successful Labourers* in the *Vineyard of our Lord*; But I will make no other Return than to assure him, it's my prayer, he may see, and consider what he has done, and that the Lord will soften his heart, and forgive him. As for what he saith of the *Reporter*, I will not repeat one word of it, only I will accquaint you with what little Reason my Brother had to Insinuate, as if the *Reporter* had been a favourer of Dr. *Crisp*'s *Errors*, and what Obligations he lyeth under to clear himself fom the suspition of *Antinomianism*; for such indeed is the Nature of *Error*, that how distant soever some Heresies are, in their appearances from each other, they frequently center in one and the same Point.

To evince what I have here suggested, 'twill be sufficient to propose what my Brother saith of the *Reporters Zeal* for Dr. *Crisps*, and make my Reply.

Faithful Rebuke.

'The *Proposal* of a full *Testimony* against *Antinomia-* 'nism, is the unpardonable Sin against Dr. *Crisp*, which 'shall never be forgiven by the *Reporter*. p. 57.

Reply.

1. That my Answer may be the more clearly understood, it must be noted, that I speak of the *Person*, who is by my Brother taken for the Reporter, whether he be Right, or not, in his Conjecture; and by the Rebuker, I mean the Man that is *Famed* to be so. This premised, I affirm,

2. That there is not the least pretence for his insinuating, that the *Reporter* is a favourer of Dr. *Crisps* Notions

Notions; but there are divers reaſons for my inſiſting on it, that my Rebuker is not free from the ſuſpition, if not liable to a charge of giving Countenance to them, and ſo ſtands bound to clear himſelf.

1. It's well known unto me, That when the *Reporter* did, about ſeventeen years ago, write againſt *Antinomianiſm*, with a particular Reference unto ſome aſſertions of Dr. *Criſp*, my Brother gave him ſufficient encouragement to expect his Mid-wifing it into the World by a *Præfatory Epiſtle*, which upon ſome noiſe made on the mention of the Doctors Name, he declin'd to do. When my Brother ſhall call to mind what he wrote in a *Letter* to Φ x, He can't, I preſume, but remember that what I here intimate, tho' ſo long ago, is very true.

2. When a *New* Impreſſion of the Doctors *Works*, with an addition of ſome *Sermons* came into the World about ſeven or eight years ſince, the *Reporter* was deſired to ſet his *Name* to the *Atteſtation* before it; but He, apprehending it would be taken for granted, at leaſt by the Common People, that His *Name* would ſtand there as an approval of all the Notions, in that Book, and enſnare many to a cloſure with the very Errours my Brother now ſeems to declaim againſt, Refuſed to ſet his *Name* unto *it*: And yet he himſelf, notwithſtanding the *Antinomian Hereſies, Horrid Opinions, and Abominable Doctrines* that He chargeth his *Congregational* Brethren with in his One and twenty Poſitions, pag. 25, 26. did ſet his *Hand* unto the Atteſtation before Dr. *Criſps* Book. And there it ſtill remains without a publick recalling it. And I think he can't eaſily forget, *when*, and where he was charged with it, and call'd upon to give ſatisfaction, but was ſo Inflexible, that no other could be obtain'd, than that the Charge was *Rude* and *Ignorant*, and ſo braved it out.

3. The *Reporter* is one never like to make any *Apologies*,

legies for the Doctors Notions, as differing from the common Belief of Proteſtants; But, this Brothers Hand is ſet to a *Flea* for them.

In a *Preface*, before Mr. *Flavels blow at the Root*, Subſcribed by the *Rebuker*, we have the following defence of thoſe very points, wherein Dr. *Criſp* forſook the *Orthodox*. For, it is there declared,

1. 'That the *Difference* between Dr. *Criſp*, and 'other *good Men*, ſeems to lye, not ſo much in the 'Things, which the one, or the other of them Believe, as about their Order and Reference *to one another*

This is one paſſage, that my Brother has *Subſcribed*: which clears it, That, if He did it with conſideration and ſincerity, He could not look on Dr. *Criſp* to hold either *Antinomian Hereſies*, or any other *horrid Opinions*, but that as to the things themſelves, the *Doctor* is of the *ſame Faith* with my *Rebuker*, which thing once granted, makes it evident, that there could be no ſuch powerful reaſons to influence Mr. *Ws.* to write againſt the Doctor as my Brother ſuggeſts, *p.* 16. for, when *Differences* are only about the *Order*, and *Reference* of one thing to another, where, as to the Things *themſelves*, there is an *Agreement*, then it becomes the Duty of thoſe Brethren, who, in theſe leſſer matters, differ from each other, to exerciſe *mutual forbearance*; and, it muſt be, in Mr. *Ws.* and thoſe zealous Brethren, who did ſet him on this Work, a Violation of the *Rule* of Chriſtian *Love* and *Forbearance*, to make this *Strife*; whence it muſt unavoidably follow, that 'twas Mr. *Ws.* who made the *Firſt breach* on the Union, and that my Rebuker, ſo long as his *Name* abides to *this Preface*, can never clear him.

2. You will ſay, There may be *Agreement* as to the *things themſelves*, and yet about their *Order*, and reference to one another, very material difference. I grant it may be ſo. Tho' for my own *part*, I do look

look on the *difference* between the *Orthodox* and Dr. *Criſp* to be much greater than this ſort of *Palliating Preface* will allow it to be, and that whilſt my Brothers *Name* continues (without a *Retractation*) to be before the Doctors Book, and under this Preface, 'twill be a Snare to multitudes; eſpecially, ſeeing He adds his further ſenſe in theſe words.

3. But we reckon, that notwithſtanding what is 'more Controverſible in Dr. *Criſps Writings*, there are 'much more Material Things, *wherein they cannot but* 'Agree, and would have come much nearer each other, 'even in theſe things, if they did take ſome Words or Terms in the *ſame* ſenſe.

What can be ſaid *more fully*, in *Favour* of Dr. *Criſps* Notions? Did ever the *Reporter* talk thus? I'll go further, if there be any thing dangerous in the Doctors Writings, as I believe there is, what can be ſaid *more* to enſnare poor People to receive that as *Sound* and *True*? Did Dr. *Chauncey* ever ſay more? Shew me where he has at any time ſaid ſo much. 'Tis true, he brings in the *Antinomian*, ſaying as much as he can in his own defence; but he alſo, if I miſtake not, tells you, that you are not to look for his Judgment there, but where he brings in *Calvin* moderating between *Neonomian* and *Antinomian*. *Once more*,

4. Whereas my Brother doth, in his *Review*, p. 25, 26. inſinuate, as if the *Catalogue* of *Antinomian Hereſies, horrid Opinions*, and *abominable Doctrines*, had been offered to the *Congregational*, that they might give ſatisfaction to the *United Brethren*, but would not, (tho' to this day, did I never hear, 'twas tendred to the *Congregational* for their Purgation) there is reckoned amongſt theſe *Abominations*, this, as the eleventh. *A believer is to work from life, & not for life.*

And what thinks my Brother of this? 'There is (ſaith he) an *Ex*-'*preſſion* in *Vol* 1. p. 46. *That Salvation is not the end of any good work* 'we do; which is like that of another, *We are to Act from Life, not* 'for *Life*. Neither of which are (ſaith he) to be rigidly taken as 'tis 'likely, *they were never meant*, in the ſtrict Senſe.

This is the *Fleſh* my Brother makes for *Criſpian* Notions, in which, if he was *not ſincere*, He ought to be as *publick* in taking the ſhame off it, as the ſetting his Name hath been; If he was *ſincere*, and has received *convincing* Light from his *Maſter* Mr. *Ws.* let him

own

own it to the World, and recal his *Hand* from the *Atteſtation* before the Doctors Writings, and from this *Preface*. But if he did *ſincerely* ſet his hand, and is ſtill of the ſame mind, let him conſider what it is that hath put him upon this *ſelf-contradicting Province*, which brings him the more under the Reprehenſion and Juſt Notice of his being a Favourer of that *Antinomianiſm*, which is in Dr. *Criſps* Books.

Thus I have, ſo far as the *Paper* allotted me would give leave, Examined the *Faithful Rebuke* of my Brother, which I call [*Faithful*] not becauſe I can ſee ſo much as one grain of *Faithfulneſs* in it, but becauſe 'tis the *Name* He has given it. And what I have done has been with *Impartiality*; For, I thank God, that I having *Felt* the *Diſpleaſure* of ſome of my *Congregational* and *Presbyterian* Brethren, becauſe a Conviction of Truth hath neceſſitated me in ſome inſtances, relating to the *True Way* to *Peace*, to differ from them both, I am the leſs concern'd tho' I pleaſe neither, ſo long as I am enabled to diſcharge a good Conſcience towards God and All Men. And as I have been *Impartial*, ſo it hath been my care to write according to the Unforeſeen advice, which the Learned and Grave Mr. *Humfrey* hath given me in his *Friendly Interpoſer* (for which I thank him) in that I have been, not only *Unmoved* in my ſelf; but have made it my endeavour, that nothing might fall from my *Pen*, expreſſive of undue reſentments. It is *Truth* I purſue, and glad ſhall I be to ſee more of *that*, whether conveyed to my *Underſtanding* in the angry way, in which my *Rebuking* Brother delivers his ſenſe; or in a more *clear*, *diſtinct* and *calm* Repreſentation.

Hitherto I muſt acknowledge, that the commonly *Received Doctrine of Proteſtants*, is in my Conſcience moſt agreeable to the Word of God in Scripture; But if at any time, whether in reading what Mr. *Humfrey* has delivered in the ſeveral *Tracts* he has Publiſhed on this Occaſion, in which there is *another* Spirit, and other Matter, and more *Mature* Thoughts than in my *Rebuker*, or otherwiſe from any *Letters* he ſpeaks of hereafter; or in reading any Books written on this Subject by any others, *I ſhall be convinced*, I am in a *miſtake*, I will not be afraid to own it, being perſuaded, that the *Truths* of God need neither Mens *Lies*, nor their *Hypocritical Methods* to ſupport them. And I muſt confeſs it, I am the better pleaſed with Mr. *Humfrey*, in that I do ſee by this *Interpoſition*, that the *halting*, the offenſive halting of Mr. *W's*, which I have formerly obſerved, and in theſe Papers my ſelf reprehended, is, in the Point of *Juſtification*, made ſo *Judiciouſly*, and *Fully* manifeſt, in this Piece, upon his own *Repugnant* Principles, that if he will be a *Follower* of *Truth*, as much as a *Leader of the People*, he muſt go quite over to Mr. *H.* (as I have already noted) or come back to the *Received Doctrine*, which he makes uſe to ſerve him only for a Gloſs, but *Recedes* from it. Whether he be *ſincere*, or no, he muſt now ſhow it.

FINIS.